University of Massachusetts Amherst
ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014

1-1-1996

Foreign students in Japan : a qualitative study of interpersonal relations between North American university exchange students and their Japanese hosts.

Patrick Dean Burns
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation
Burns, Patrick Dean, "Foreign students in Japan : a qualitative study of interpersonal relations between North American university exchange students and their Japanese hosts." (1996). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 2287.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2287

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

312066 0298 2273 7

FIVE COLLEGE
DEPOSITORY

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN JAPAN: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN NORTH AMERICAN UNIVERSITY EXCHANGE STUDENTS AND THEIR JAPANESE HOSTS

A Dissertation Presented

by

PATRICK DEAN BURNS

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 1996

School of Education

© Copyright 1996 by Patrick Dean Burns
All Rights Reserved

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN JAPAN: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN NORTH AMERICAN UNIVERSITY EXCHANGE STUDENTS AND THEIR JAPANESE HOSTS

A Dissertation Presented

by

PATRICK DEAN BURNS

Approved as to style and content by:

George E. Urch, Chair

Barbara B. Burn, Member

Robert J. Miltz, Member

Chisato Kitagawa, Member

Bailey W. Jackson, Dean
School of Education

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Linda, and our three children, Sarah, Anna, and Jake, whose sacrifice and support made this a joint project.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the generous and valuable support that Kwansei Gakuin University provided during the course of this research endeavor. First, they have created an excellent exchange program for international exchange students. Secondly, they created the conditions for me to carry out the project.

ABSTRACT

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN JAPAN: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN NORTH AMERICAN UNIVERSITY EXCHANGE STUDENTS AND THEIR JAPANESE HOSTS

SEPTEMBER 1996

PATRICK DEAN BURNS

B.A., UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN MADISON

MASTER OF INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL FOR INTERNATIONAL TRAINING

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor George Urch

This dissertation analyzes a study which focused on the problem of interpersonal relationship development between Japanese hosts and visiting North American exchange students during their one year of studying abroad at a Japanese university. The study identified and analyzed factors that contributed to, or inhibited social interaction which led to effective interpersonal relations. The research described and explained the interpersonal relationship development experience of the research participants.

A qualitative interpretive case study, participants included both North American exchange students and Japanese people with whom they developed relationships. Data collection was accomplished over a one-year period utilizing in-depth interviewing and direct behavior observation methods.

Results included identification of cross-cultural social-psychological factors which contributed to and

inhibited effective interpersonal relationship development. An analysis of cultural value-orientation differences led to the explanation of problems in relationship development.

The North American exchange students established cordial relationships with Japanese people and were overall very satisfied with the exchange program and their one-year experience. However, the study concluded that North American students were disappointed with the perceived shallowness of relationship development. This negatively impacted their cultural and language learning. Recommendations were made to study abroad administrators in Japan and North America, as well as to prospective North American exchange students and researchers. These recommendations were in the areas of cross-cultural understanding and orientation, programming, advising and recruitment, and future research efforts. These recommendations are designed to assist in enhancing relationship development effectiveness.

The dissertation includes a review of study abroad research literature that focused on social interaction and interpersonal relations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

This dissertation describes a study that focused on interpersonal relationship development between Japanese hosts and visiting North American exchange students during their one-year exchange at a Japanese university. The field research was conducted at Kwansei Gakuin University in Nishinomiya, Japan, during the 1992-93 school year. The study resulted in the description of types of social interaction and identification and an analysis of social-psychological factors. These factors either contributed to, or inhibited positive interpersonal relationship development between Japanese hosts and the visiting North American exchange students.

Problem Statement

Study abroad is an activity in which students study at a foreign academic institution. It is an educational strategy employed by higher education institutions around the world. This strategy is utilized to contribute to the internationalization of universities, increase language and cultural learning of its participants, and to create institutional linkages between the involved universities. The number of students who study in a foreign country is increasing every year, with over one million students

world-wide studying outside their own country every year (Altbach, 1991).

With the increase in numbers of students, study abroad programs in higher education have increased in both number and variety. This increase has led study abroad administrators to seek additional information on which to base program decisions. Systematic study abroad research can help contribute to systematic program development and help increase the understanding of study abroad's effects on students.

An important variable for the success of study abroad programs has been the development of positive interpersonal relationships between visiting students and host students. Social interaction which leads to positive interpersonal relationship development between host and foreign students has been important for the success of higher education study abroad programs in any country. In many cases, including some Japan/America exchanges, positive relationship development has been a problem. If foreign study administrators in Japan and the United States better understand the social interaction processes that influence Japanese/American student relationship development, they may be better able to develop programs which increase the likelihood of positive interpersonal relationship development.

Previous research has not been able to adequately explain the social-psychological processes which lead to

positive interpersonal relationship development between hosts and visitors. The explanatory and analytical focus of past research has been weak. Administrators and practitioners have not been informed of why there is successful or unsuccessful interpersonal relationship development.

The reasons for poor interpersonal relationship development are not well understood. Specific interactions between host and visiting students have not been systematically described and analyzed. Without systematic description and analysis there has been a lack of theory with which to view and explain interpersonal relationship development. In addition, student perspectives have not been well documented. Their perspectives on the dynamics of interpersonal relationships are important for increased understanding.

There have been several problems in the approach to past research that this study was designed to overcome:

1. Past social interaction research has often been atheoretical and lacked a conceptual framework. Much of the writing on social interaction has been *ad hoc* and anecdotal. In order to increase understanding of interpersonal relationship development, a more theoretical framework is necessary.
2. Past research has often over-emphasized quantitative impact studies and not paid enough attention to the qualitative aspects of social interaction. Many of

these impact studies have basically measured whether or not foreign students attained positive attitudes toward their study abroad host country. Impact studies increase knowledge of results, but not understanding of the processes that contributed to the results.

3. There has been a lack of longitudinal studies. Interpersonal relationships have to be looked at in a developmental perspective. In order to identify variables and analyze their interrelationship, data collection over a period of time is necessary.
4. Study samples have rarely consisted of both host and visiting students. The usual focus is on visiting students. Interpersonal relationship development is a reciprocal process. Investigation of students from both cultures is necessary for understanding this reciprocal process.
5. There has been a lack of collaborative studies between host and visiting country researchers. If both cultures' students are to be included in the sample, then it is necessary for collaboration between researchers from the two cultures. This will increase the likelihood of cultural appropriateness in data collection procedures and data interpretation.

Overcoming these problems could increase the likelihood of studies that are cross-culturally reliable, and which are able to identify and analyze the processes

that lead to positive interpersonal relationship development.

Study Purpose

The primary purpose of the study was to identify and analyze social-psychological factors which lead to the development of, or were obstacles to, positive interpersonal relationships between Japanese and American students at a Japanese university. The focus was on the social interaction between these students, both in dyads and in small groups.

Findings included a description of the social interaction processes and an interpretation of the interrelationship between processes. Interpretation and analysis of these processes could contribute to the conceptual base for the study of social interaction between Japanese hosts and North American exchange students at Japanese universities.

The findings may appear to reflect a negative experience for the exchange students. This was not the case. they had an overall positive experience. Their exchange program enabled them to achieve a lot of language and cross-cultural learning. However, there is more of an emphasis on the identification and analysis of problems. Problem identification is meant to benefit the intended audience of the study.

The intended audience of the study is study abroad and foreign student administrators and practitioners in Japan and the United States, as well as North American students who plan to study abroad in Japan.

This study could increase the understanding of interpersonal relationship development by study abroad administrators in Japan and the United States, and North American students. For administrators, findings could be used to assist in making programmatic decisions for study abroad programs. This could include the areas of student recruitment and advising, institutional linkages, and pre-departure and post-return cultural orientation programs. For North American exchange students, the findings could be used to better anticipate the nature of social interactions in Japan, and increase the possibility of establishing positive interpersonal relationships during their study abroad experience in Japan.

Secondary purposes include:

1. The provision of a forum for Japanese and American students to discuss and process their cross-cultural experience through an interactive research methodology.
2. The development of a collaborative research model with Mr. Yoshitaka Seiya, a Lecturer at Kwansei Gakuin University in Nishinomiya, Japan. This increased the reliability of cross-cultural questions and interpretations, and the cultural appropriateness of

theoretical frameworks. It also created the potential for a long term intellectual relationship between myself and Mr. Seiya.

3. The generation of concepts for use in the examination of interpersonal relationship development in study abroad programs in Japan. This was accomplished through a convergence of past study abroad research concepts and the new concepts generated through the qualitative exploration approach utilized in this study.

Research Questions

The primary question that guided the study was, "what social-psychological factors contribute to, or hinder, positive interpersonal relationship development between Japanese and North American students at Kwansei Gakuin University?"

Implementing questions:

1. How are positive interpersonal relationships defined by the students? Is the definition different between the two cultural groups?
2. What types of social interaction produce positive interpersonal relationship development?
3. What factors inhibit or promote social interaction which results in positive interpersonal relationship development?

4. What kind of group norms are created as a consequence of the difference in American and Japanese cultural values, and how do these norms modify communication and social interaction processes?

Attempting to answer these questions increases the understanding of interpersonal relationship development. Questions emerged from the review of literature. The research questions remained basically the same during the course of the study. Procedures for addressing these questions, and the concepts which underlie them, are described in Chapter 3. The questions are specifically answered at the end of Chapter 4.

Rationale and Significance of the Study

Increased knowledge of social interaction processes is important for practitioners to make decisions regarding the development and implementation of study abroad programs. Prior understanding of these processes are necessary for North American study abroad students to quickly and more effectively begin their formation of relationships when they study abroad in Japan. The following outlines the importance of positive social interaction in achieving study abroad goals and a review of authors who support the importance of social interaction research.

Social Interaction Related to Study Abroad Goals

There are many goals for study abroad programs and the students who participate. Foreign students include both participants in short-term organized study abroad programs and students who independently enroll in degree programs at foreign universities (Altbach, 1991). This discussion focuses on structured and organized programs of study abroad, primarily at higher education institutions. Institutions and governments indirectly affect decisions about study abroad through what kinds of programs are offered, accreditation practices, and immigration laws and regulations.

Goals can be broken down into four levels: individual, institutional, national, and international:

1. Individual Goals- These include personal growth, career preparation, and lower cost at a foreign institution.
2. Institutional Goals- These include inter-institutional linkages, responding to government or institutional policy, and drawing the best students by offering attractive study abroad programs.
3. National Goals- These include increasing the number of citizens who possess skills and awareness for interacting with other cultures' citizens, and increased technical and economic development. Hosting individuals who may be key government leaders

upon return will hopefully lead to closer political ties with these leaders' nations.

4. International Goals- These include increased understanding and friendship between nations, as well as heightened awareness of common global issues and problems.

The diversity of study abroad goals results in an abundance of variables that affect the success or failure of study abroad programs. These variables provide a wide range of areas for research. Any research questions which are formulated must originate from the goals that study abroad administrators and program sponsors articulate.

The study of social interaction in study abroad has ramifications for goals on all levels, but the object of inquiry in this study was individual interaction. My perspective is the same as Klineberg's (1976):

> We would propose that many of these goals may best be approached by a study of the experiences of the individuals involved in the exchange process. What a university or a nation gains from foreign nationals clearly depends on what they contribute by their presence, the point of view and the information they bring, their relationships with the surrounding community, their adaptation, their attitudes. Even at the international level, everything depends on how the judgments of individuals are affected by the foreign sojourn. This in turn means that the manner in which these individuals are received, and their own judgment of what the experience has meant to them, become crucial in the determination of the impact of the program on international relations. (p. 16)

Social interaction of individuals strongly influences how they understand and feel about their experience. Marshall

(1970) echoed this view in the relationship between international goals and individual goals. "For, although the ultimate goal is understanding between nations, the instrument in this case is the individual student" (p. 19).

Burn (1985) said that the fundamental rationale for study abroad is encouragement of empathetic knowledge and understanding of other cultures so that the pool of internationally informed citizenry is increased. This implies that social interactions will be an integral component toward accomplishing an empathetic understanding of other cultures.

Importance of Social Interaction in Study Abroad Programs

Many researchers point out the importance of successful social interactions during the sojourn. Altbach (1991) identified social interaction patterns as one of the most important areas for future study abroad research. Bennett, Passin, and McKnight (1958) succinctly articulated the importance of social interaction in the study abroad experience and a corresponding imperative for social interaction research. "Since many goals of incoming persons are to be met through the medium of interpersonal relations, the intricacies of this learning and adjustment process constitute one of the major theoretical and practical problems in the study of intercultural experience" (p. 226). Interpersonal relations are clearly intertwined with all aspects of adjustment in study abroad.

Opper, Teichler, and Carlson (1990) found that the most important mode for learning about the host culture was through conversations with host nationals. This implies the need for effective social interaction. In Garraty and Adams (1959), a professor experienced in directing study abroad groups in Europe discussed the problems of adjustment. He said that "the first thing you need, above all else, is a friend" (p. 104). Friendship formation implies positive social interaction.

Study abroad experiences in attitude development also are interrelated with social interaction. Study abroad goals around attitude development can be seen in two dimensions. Favorability toward the host culture and a differentiated attitude toward all foreign cultures are both potential outcomes in study abroad. Kelman (1975) felt that both of these will occur if the visitor gains new knowledge of the host culture through positive interaction with host nationals.

Some researchers felt that positive social interaction can be such a powerful force that it pervades all aspects of the study abroad experience and can even overcome negative experiences during the sojourn. Klineberg and Hull's (1979) "modified culture contact hypothesis" went a step further than previous "association hypotheses," in which success in interpersonal relations was seen as a simple function of increase in quantity of social contact. In their modified hypothesis, personal contact was seen as being a contributor

to all aspects of the study abroad experience. "This finding strengthens the widespread conviction that facilitating such contact is crucial to the success of the whole exchange enterprise" (Klineberg & Hull, 1979, p. 189). Hull (1981) wrote that later positive social contacts can overcome initial negative experiences, such as discrimination. DuBois (1956) also saw that the ability to establish supportive interpersonal relationships could mediate other situational factors that are potentially damaging to self-esteem. "In general, a legitimate argument is that interpersonal relations have greater influence on adjustment to a foreign culture than do accidental experiences, administrative regulations, or material environment" (p. 93).

Social interaction is an important area for investigation in study abroad. It is one of the most important dynamics in the adjustment process of foreign students.

Definition of Terms

Study Abroad- This term can be used interchangeably with international educational exchange, and foreign study. Metraux's (1952) definition of study abroad is as enduring as it is old:

> It is a process of cross-cultural education, which for our purposes may be defined as the social process of acquiring knowledge of an intellectual or technical nature, under institutionalized conditions outside one's own social and cultural environment. It is obvious that there are many

> types of cross-cultural education. Here we confine ourselves to the study of cross-cultural education on the academic level, i.e., educational travel among university and college personnel (p. 1).

This definition fits for the discussion of study abroad in this study. I would add one point to this definition, "outside one's own social and cultural environment for a limited amount of time." This addition serves to distinguish between a sojourner and an emigrant. In addition, Metraux also wrote a good history on study abroad in his book.

Sojourn- This is the period that the foreign student actually spends outside his/her own country. The whole study abroad experience, as mentioned before, also includes the pre-sojourn and post-sojourn periods. Sojourner then refers to the student at the point of time when she/he is studying in the foreign country. Sojourner can be used interchangeably with both foreign student and exchange student.

Hosts/Host Nationals - These terms refer to Japanese people who had contact with the North American exchange students. Hosts can be thought of as the general Japanese population, and not only Japanese people comprising the study sample. When referring to a more specific group, the term "hosts" is followed by the word identifying the group, such as "host students" or "host family."

Study Participants - This refers to the North American exchange students and the Japanese people who were part of this study's sample group.

Summary

The initial research questions emerged from past study abroad research concepts and existing theories in the wider social science field. The study abroad concepts and social science theories are analyzed in the next chapter. The research questions provided a starting point into the investigation of the problem of positive interpersonal relationship development between Japanese and North American students.

Chapter 2 reviews and analyzes past study abroad research. Chapter 3 describes the research design and procedures. Chapter 4 reports the data analysis and interpretation and Chapter 5 lists recommendations based upon the analysis and interpretation.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review was the result of an investigation of study abroad research, with special emphasis on social interaction and interpersonal relationship development involved in sojourner adjustment. The primary purpose of this review was to identify and analyze the major issues that surround the theories and methodological approaches of study abroad research, especially social interaction research. The design of the study that is the subject of this dissertation, and my position on future study abroad research, partly resulted from the findings of this literature review.

Guiding Questions

The primary question for this review was, "what are the major issues that surround study abroad research, and what implications arise from an analysis of them?"
The following implementing questions are addressed:

1. What are the general theoretical and methodological characteristics of study abroad research which are found in the literature?
2. What implications arise from an analysis of past research?

3. What is the significance of social interaction research for the study abroad field?
4. How is social interaction related to the overall goals of study abroad programs?
5. How do researchers define social interaction?
6. What are the overall findings of past social interaction research and the implications for future research?

These questions will be systematically answered in the following sections entitled, "overview of study abroad research" and "social interaction research."

Literature Review Procedure

This review employed an investigation of the study abroad field as the method of inquiry. Sources for the investigation were mostly primary, with a few secondary sources included. The data for this review came from study abroad research books, articles, and reports. Sources were found in the University of Massachusetts Amherst library and through inter-library loan. My focus was on data gained from empirical research, or analyses and critiques of empirical research. I concentrated on studies and articles which looked at sojourn adjustment, and were conceptual in their content. Most literature that I reviewed was found among several reviews and bibliographies of study abroad research (Breitenbach, 1970a; Church, 1982;

Klineberg, 1970; Lulat, 1985; Spaulding & Flack, 1976; Weaver, 1989).

This review dealt with study abroad literature that is conceptual and has been valuable in theory construction. The largest gap in study abroad research literature to date has been a lack of conceptualization and theory construction. Burn (1985) wrote, "Research and evaluation on study abroad have been seriously neglected. What exists is spotty, lacking in comprehensiveness, and all too often anecdotal rather than systematic and scientific" (p. 57).

I approached this review of study abroad research from the perspective of adjustment and learning on the part of the foreign student, host students, other contacts in the host culture, and also contacts and established relationships in the home culture upon return. The perspective of learning and adjustment must be seen as a number of stages through time, the actual sojourn period being only one point in time (Klineberg, 1981).

There are various approaches to describing, explaining, and analyzing foreign student adjustment; curves of adjustment, culture shock, personality typologies, attitudinal changes, background and situational factors, motivation, and social interaction. This review focused on social interaction and interpersonal relationship development as the most important factor in adjustment and learning. There were two reasons for this: (1) This review showed that the literature suggested this

is probably the single most important factor in determining a successful study abroad experience; and (2) The other variables listed above can be better understood if they are all discussed in terms of their connection to interpersonal relationship development.

The research suggested a need for the synthesis of administrative and social science research (Elliott, 1965; Breitenbach, 1970b). Research for administrative purposes should increase understanding of study abroad's effects and processes in order to make policy and programmatic decisions, while research for social science purposes should help to "broaden our knowledge of human beings and their social behavior" (DuBois, 1953, p. 7) and contribute to the wider body of social-psychological literature and knowledge.

This review, and the study subsequently undertaken, emphasized foreign students as social-psychological entities, rather than focusing on the administrative and programmatic aspects of study abroad. Both are equally important, and a combination of both, so that they inform each other, needs to be accomplished.

Overview of Study Abroad Literature

Since study abroad programs began to be systematically researched just after World War Two, many of the characteristics of the research field have remained fairly constant. Listed below are general characteristics that

have constituted the research field. There are of course exceptions to these generalizations, but these should suffice for a basic understanding of the field. The overview is of the study abroad literature as it relates to adjustment of the sojourner.

> It is important for those making generalizations concerning foreign study to fully understand that the existing research base is very limited in terms of the countries analyzed, the questions asked, and the paradigms used. (Altbach, 1991, p. 307).

With this in mind, the following section identifies nine characteristics of study abroad research.

Research Characteristics

1. In sheer numbers, there have been a large number of studies conducted. In two recent study abroad research bibliographies (Altbach, Kelly & Lulat, 1985; Altbach & Wang, 1989), there are more than 3,400 books, dissertations, and articles listed. These listings have all been published since 1970.
2. Most studies have been small in sample size and limited in scope. Especially in the last decade, the greatest number of studies have been doctoral dissertations. These have been conducted by individuals, usually self-funded, and have studied single programs and small sample sizes. Very few of these are cited as sources in works other than Altbach et al.'s bibliographies. The authors stated that these studies are not a very important body of work.

Church (1982) bemoaned the fact that a lot of overgeneralizations have been made. Sample sizes of most studies have been small. Large sample sizes have been the exception. A couple of these exceptions were Klineberg and Hull's (1979) study which investigated 2,536 students from 11 different countries and the more recent Study Abroad Evaluation Project (SAEP) (Burn, Cerych, & Smith, 1990), which had approximately 1,000 students who participated in the study at some point.

Conversely, some critics suggested that it is precisely the smaller "micro" studies which are needed. The reasoning is that these kinds of studies are best able to generate useful concepts and theory. Klineberg (1981) suggested that much can be learned about the sojourn experience from the study of individual cases, generating a "life history" approach. Breitenbach (1970a) declared, "it was the smaller studies, based on careful theoretical preparation, and not the extremely expensive stereotyped routine studies, which supplied the new and useful scientific and practical results" (p. 75). Echoing similar sentiments, Bennett, Passin, and McKnight (1958) wrote, "We advocate more research into particular cases, into the configurations of individual experience in different cultural settings; and perhaps less research at the level of generalized attitude and personality tests" (p. 179).

The classic Social Science Research Council (SSRC) studies in the 1950s and '60s are examples of small studies

in sample sizes that generated many concepts and theoretical constructs. The Committee on Cross-Cultural Education was established in 1952 by the SSRC. Between 1952 and 1963, the committee received support from the Carnegie Corporation, and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. The committee sponsored several studies which have had a great influence on study abroad research.

There was an initial set of studies (Beals & Humphrey, 1957; Bennett, Passin, & McKnight, 1958; Lambert & Bressler, 1956; Scott, 1956) which were exploratory. The general approach was holistic, eclectic, and anthropological. They were meant to cover all possible variables and to generate theories and concepts which could be explored more specifically in the second phase of the project. The idea was to begin generation of a natural history of study abroad. The second phase incorporated the concepts generated in the first phase. These second phase studies (Coelho, 1958; Morris, 1960; Selltiz, Christ, Havel, & Cook, 1963; Sewell & Davidsen 1961) tested hypotheses that were generated in the first phase.

Data collection methods used in both the first and second phases were primarily intensive interviews, participant observation, analysis of life histories, scales and questionnaires. These studies provided some important bases for future studies. "The most coherent and integrated body of research on the subject can be found in the series sponsored by the SSRC in the 1950's" (Elliott,

1965, p. 62). Breitenbach (1970b) considered the SSRC studies, along with three others (DuBois, 1956; Useem & Useem, 1955; Watson & Lippitt, 1955) as the "classics" on the problems of foreign study. This was before 1970.

Small samples as the rule has probably been due more to funding inadequacies rather than methodological considerations. Since most studies have been self-funded, the time and money has not been available for large-scale studies. The Study Abroad Evaluation Project (SAEP) study is an exceptional example. U.S. participation in the project was funded by the United States Information Agency, the Council on International Educational Exchange, and NAFSA: Association for International Educators.

There has to be a balance between studies with large sample sizes and those that study individual cases (programs or individual students). The large sample sizes are needed for consumers of investigations who want to be able to generalize findings to other populations. If funding for study abroad research is to be increased, studies with large sample sizes are more likely to demonstrate the value of study abroad and study abroad research to potential funders. Studies which propose large sample sizes are also more likely to be funded.

On the other hand, smaller studies can be more appropriate for generating concepts and theory through which the dynamics and processes of the study abroad experience can be investigated. If study abroad research

had an infinity of funds, the ideal situation would be to conduct many small case studies in order to generate a natural history of study abroad and its conceptualization, and then to test some of the theory, through hypotheses formation, using larger sample sizes and methods that can be quantified. This was what the SSRC had in mind.

3. Most studies have been conducted at one point in time, with a lack of longitudinal studies. When discussing the adjustment and learning process, it should be kept in mind that it is just that--a process. Longitudinal studies are needed in order to better understand the dynamics of study abroad and to produce histories of study abroad programs and individual students. Based upon the assumption that real practical use of the study abroad experience depends upon what happens to the sojourner after returning to his/her home culture, the post-return phase needs to be investigated more completely. Almost everyone writing in the literature calls for post-return studies, but they are still small in number.

Some researchers posited that longitudinal studies are needed in order to better understand phases of adjustment and curves of adjustment (Klineberg, 1976; Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963). The phase of adjustment may affect a sojourner's perception, and so in order to have reliable information on attitudes, learning changes, and personal growth, it must be seen over time. Sewell and Davidsen

(1956) recognized the necessity of investigating over a period of time. "Experience suggests that analysis of change over time is crucial to both the theoretical and practical aspects of cross-cultural education... data should be obtained at or near time of experiences rather than reconstructed on the basis of recall" (p. 86).

It is difficult to disagree with the recommendation for more longitudinal studies. Procedures such as pre-tests and post-return data can assist in isolating variables that are responsible for learning and change, especially those of a social-psychological nature. Longitudinal studies during the post-return phase also can inform as to the returned student's place in the social structure, and evaluate the impact of study abroad programs taking into account social, political, and economic changes, both in the home country and the rest of the world.

A particularly promising theoretical area that could be explored, with more post-return studies, is transfer of learning. There is a large body of training research literature around transfer of learning, and if the effects of study abroad are to be completely assessed, the transfer of learning is essential to research.

4. There has been an overabundance of studies on attitude. Most of these studies measure students' attitudes toward the host country. Attitude studies started gaining their popularity shortly after World

that there is no evidence to support the claim that overt verbal responses regarding attitudes will be reflected in behavior. The findings of these attitudinal studies are also suspect in light of the findings of some post-return studies. Useem and Useem (1955) found that Indian students' attitudes toward the United Sates changed after their return to India, based upon their ensuing relationships with fellow Indians. For example, if they wanted their sojourn to the United States to be increased in prestige, they were likely to speak more positively of the United States.

Student attitudes are important in how they relate to other aspects of the experience, how they fit in with the process of learning and development. If attitude change is viewed as a means for achieving something, and not an end in itself, to assess favorability or not, then it can inform as to its part in the learning process.

A more promising conceptualization of attitudes for study abroad research is "attitude differentiation" (Mishler, 1965). Rather than measuring favorability or unfavorability toward one culture, it may be more valuable to determine if the sojourn results in a better understanding and acceptance of all other cultures in general. Attitude differentiation means that one's perception of other cultures is overall positive, and that this perception leads to the reserving of judgment and

resistance to stereotyping. These abilities enable one to more effectively learn about and accept other cultures.

In order to address the methodological shortcomings of verbal responses, more overt behavioral studies should be conducted. Post-return studies are also essential to gain an understanding of how attitude develops over time. This again assumes that the real value of study abroad is reflected upon return to the home culture.

5. Most research has been conducted by researchers in industrialized, receiving countries, with most of these studies coming from the United States.

One of the results of this is that much of the research has been culturally biased. Findings are difficult to generalize across different cultural groups. Methods of data collection are sometimes difficult to adapt to a different culture. For example, a questionnaire that asks for a response on "friendships" will get a different response from different cultural groups, depending upon how each one defines friendships. The Useems (1955) asserted that research conceived of in one culture but carried out in another will unavoidably result in unconscious ethnocentrism.

The SAEP (Burn, et al., 1990) used a multinational research team, collaborating with American and European researchers. This allowed an inquiry into both European and American students' experiences, with culturally appropriate inquiry more likely. Klineberg and Hull's

(1979) 11 country study not only allowed comparisons between the students from these 11 countries, but made the methodology more culturally appropriate. They had project directors in each of the 11 countries. They all joined together to formulate the conceptual underpinnings to the study, so that these were uniform across the 11 countries. Then each country's project director was responsible for designing the content of the data collection instruments (questionnaire and interviews) so that they were culturally appropriate.

Research coming out of other countries is needed. Not only would the content of the studies be in the context of a wider range of cultures, but non-Western research perspectives would become more developed. More can be learned about study abroad if there are more diverse perspectives with which to view it.

Studies similar in theory and methodology could be carried out in multiple countries in order to provide a comparative perspective of study abroad. Klineberg and Hull's (1979) and the SAEP study (Burn et al., 1990) had multinational student samples.

Another variation on the comparative level was the Useems' (1955) study in India. They investigated and compared Indian students who had studied in two different countries; the United Kingdom and the United States. The findings shed light on the cultural differences of the two countries while assessing the different impact on the

students. This kind of study has implications for study abroad policy-makers and students in making decisions about study abroad. Knowing the different effects of study abroad in different countries can be information to help make a decision about where to study, based upon motivation. For example, the Useems (1955) found that the American-trained students were more dependent upon technology than the British-trained students. If national goals and individual goals reflected increased skill in technology and if the country had the infra-structure to support this increased skill, then it would be one factor in choosing the United States over the United Kingdom.

Collaboration between host country and home country researchers for a given study abroad program would help increase understanding of the program processes and effects on both host and visiting students. Research questions should be formulated by researchers, in collaboration with study abroad administrators, from both of the cultures involved in the foreign study program. Not only would multicultural perspectives be incorporated into research, but linkages between researchers from different countries could be established.

Establishing a cooperative, reciprocal research process would help contribute to a new international education paradigm which Mestenhauser (1982) opined that we need; a new paradigm to incorporate international education, and specifically foreign study, into a changing

world. In the old paradigm, foreign students came to the United Sates for study in an excellent American university and then went back to their country to contribute to its technical and economic development. It was a unidirectional relationship. With the United States' economic decline, the world's interdependence is becoming a reality for us. Americans are now beginning to recognize the difficulties in transfer of technology to other cultures because of cultural bias, Western modes of communication, and information and retrieval systems that exist mostly in the English language (Kaplan, 1983). In addition to the English language, a student must adopt an understanding of basic science and scientific method, which is largely based upon Western assumptions about epistemology. Students return to their home culture where there is not an intellectual infrastructure to support their new learning (Weiler, 1984).

Goodwin and Nacht (1986) expanded upon this in their metaphoric style, calling this condition "intellectual decay." They attribute much of the problem to American curriculum and American faculty's concern with educational standards. This causes an intellectual paternalism which prevents American higher education from seeing natural science and social science as anything but Western inventions.

Among the identified strategies for developing a new paradigm are (1) strategies which inquire into causes of

resistance to global thinking, interdependence, and cooperative thinking; and (2) strategies which encourage new efforts in cross-cultural research.

Collaborative study abroad research is a strategy which can accomplish both of these purposes. It can help prevent an unconscious ethnocentrism which may be a cause of resistance to global thinking. New efforts in cross-cultural research could result from multi-national research. 6. Very few studies have investigated the reciprocal aspects of study abroad. Almost all studies have looked at the sojourner and not at the impact on host students, faculty, or host families. There also have been very few studies which inquire into the effects on the students' home-country contacts after return. This lack of research into the reciprocal aspects of study abroad was cited by numerous researchers, including (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Smith, 1956a).

Reciprocity is thought to be a desirable aspect of study abroad programs (Burn, 1980). In a January, 1992 interview, Dr. Burn articulated the following as advantages of reciprocity in exchanges: (1) Reciprocity can help ensure continuity of the exchange; (2) It can contribute to faculty awareness in international education and their involvement in it; (3) Tied to the continuity notion is that reciprocity encourages institutional commitment to the exchange. One can know that more students will be coming again next year; (4) Reciprocity creates more awareness

that the institution is international; and (5) Increases the quality of students who participate. In order to maintain on-going relationships, an institution will want to send its more qualified students.

Reciprocity as a concept has implications on the individual and group level in terms of learning and adjustment. Smith (1956b) defined cross-cultural education as "a reciprocal process of learning and adjustment" (p. 3). This is on an individual level and a societal level, viewing cross-cultural education as a process of cultural diffusion. Marshall (1970) saw reciprocity as the most important element in the exchange of students. He wrote that the "essential element is not equivalence, but reciprocity, or mutual advantage gained by concerted action in pursuit of common or complementary goals" (p. 5).

Given the importance and desirability of reciprocity in student exchanges, research questions should address the nature of reciprocity in exchanges. This implies the need to study effects on hosts (students, faculty, families, host institution) and on home country contacts after return.

Studying home country contacts after return would address the issue of whether or not study abroad results in cultural diffusion. By studying host country contacts, host country learning about the home country of the student can be assessed. In order to see if it is a reciprocal process, there is a need to see if the student acts as a

culture carrier (Eide, 1970), enabling home country contacts to learn of the culture that was visited by the foreign student. Eide viewed this whole process as the ideology of reciprocity in student exchange.

Another research implication is the need to simultaneously study impacts on visiting students and host students participating in the same institution and/or program. In order to see if there was mutual advantage gained by the host and visiting students from the same experience, examination of both sets of students is needed. For example, if research found that the sojourn was resulting in the sojourner's increased differentiated attitude toward foreign cultures, but found that host students actually had their stereotypes reinforced by their interactions with the visiting student, then study abroad policy-makers would want to re-examine program goals and/or processes.

In order to conduct this kind of research, collaboration between researchers from both the home and host culture is needed. Culturally appropriate data collection methods, concepts, and the correct research questions to ask would require this kind of joint research.

7. Research has focused on sojourner outcomes and identification of adjustment problems.

This has been a result of the need to inform administrators and policy-makers of the effects of study

abroad in order to make programmatic and managerial decisions.

While this kind of research certainly is valuable, I agree with Church (1982) in the call for more research into the dynamics of adjustment. Research into the dynamics of adjustment can better inform as to the variables that are responsible for different adjustment processes.

Another way to look at this is by differentiating between evaluation and research. Evaluation is the measurement of performance, characteristics, or effects that are related to a pre-determined program goal. Sojourner outcome research seems to be more evaluation than research--looking at impacts related to program goals, and assessing whether or not they are compatible. This kind of investigation is needed for validating programs for funding, and is applied to administrative procedures. More research into the social-psychological aspects of study abroad is needed. This would get more into study abroad dynamics and processes in addition to study abroad outcomes. It would give a better understanding of the foreign student as a social-psychological entity rather than an administrative problem. DuBois (1953) articulated this well.

> I suspect that we will understand our problems better if we do our first thinking in terms of social change, personality dynamics, culture contrasts, roles, and comparable concepts, rather than in terms of what administratively is called the foreign student- his selection, his orientation, his placement, his accreditation, etc. (p. 64)

Teichler (1996) echoed this thinking in an article regarding academic mobility:

> . . . it is equally important to ensure that not all the research activities are subordinated to practical evaluation and assessment desires, but also focus on theoretical, methodological, and other perspectives beyond immediate practical needs. (p. 343)

There must be more of a balance between administrative research, or evaluation, and social science research. Breitenbach (1970a) , expanding on an earlier article by Elliott (1965), expressed the need for a reciprocal instruction process between international education administrators and social scientists. Social scientists must become aware of administrators' decision-making constraints and administrators should be informed by social scientists as to the theoretical background of their own actions. It should be the job of administrators to clearly state the goals of study abroad and then social scientists should empirically investigate the outcomes and processes of study abroad programs.

A working group of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) has formulated a research agenda meant to strengthen the internationalization of higher education in the United States. In a report (1995),

they identified ". . . the in-depth, social science-based exploration of an important topic over a number of years" (p. 27) as one of four types of research that fall within their agenda. The AIEA consists of national leaders in the field of International Higher Education. Their research agenda and call for social science-based exploration demonstrates the potential for cooperation between international education administrators and social scientists.

One of the barriers to this kind of relationship is that practitioners generally do not have time for research, in addition to the other demands of their jobs, and social scientists are not sufficiently rewarded by their departments and institutions for international education research (Burn, 1985). When practitioners do find time and resources, the impartiality of the findings can be questioned (Burn et al., 1990).

Another problem is that many practitioners usually do not understand traditional social science research language. Few have learned the research methodology and technical jargon involved in research. This prevents communication between the two groups from occurring.

Two approaches to these problems may begin to provide solutions: (1) Research approaches that incorporate an understandable language should be increasingly practiced, so that research reports and communication from social scientists can be better understood by practitioners.

Research of a more qualitative, or naturalistic nature, holds prospects for the future in this regard; and (2) The international office at higher education institutions could staff themselves with personnel who combine administrative work with scholarly work, including research.

An effective approach to administrators and social scientists instructing each other would be to have individuals in international offices who do work of both kinds. I previously mentioned that many practitioners do not understand social science research. The general practitioners who work in University International Offices can be differentiated from some national leaders in the field of International Education Administration. These leaders in the field have been involved research. Many members of AIEA are among this leadership. Good models of this kind of international educator are Barbara Burn from the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, William Allaway from the University of California system, and Joseph Mestenhauser, most recently from the University of Minnesota. They have been involved in research, writing, and teaching, as well as administrative responsibilities.

Of course the institution must be supportive of this kind of situation, financially and philosophically, for it to happen, unless an administrator is willing to sacrifice free time in order to work on more scholarly projects. The other advantage is that this kind of international administrator is in an advantageous position to practice

and apply programs based upon theory and concepts of which they helped to generate.

These sorts of individuals also can be found at some of the private international education organizations, such as Cora DuBois in the past at the Institute of International Education (IIE) and more recently Elinor Barber at the same place. NAFSA-Association for International Educators (NAFSA) and the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) also have provided a bridge between study abroad administrators and social scientists through funding of projects and publications.

8. Study abroad research methodologies have been underdeveloped, lack in clarity, and have generally followed a traditional quantitative research paradigm. Because of the diverse goals of study abroad programs, and the resultant numerous variables to address in research, methodological difficulties arise.

Regarding variables, Paige (1978) identified the abundance of variables to investigate in study abroad as a problem in the field. This is seen as a problem for making research methodologies more uniform, but can present an exciting opportunity for this field of research to inquire into many different areas.

Variables are factors that affect the study abroad experience. They are factors that can be changed or influenced. For example, university policies regarding

study abroad students can affect their experience. These policies can be changed by the university. Whether or not a sojourner adjusts to the foreign culture is a variable that affects the study abroad experience.

Since there are so many different variables involved, there are also many different research questions, requiring different approaches to inquiry. Variables can be looked at on two levels; the broader variables which contribute to the overall study abroad experience and then the more specific variables within each of these broad categories. For example, in the broad category, some of the variables include; academic performance, mental health-related issues, language proficiency and development, brain drain, institutional policy, national policy, and cross-cultural adjustment during the sojourn. Within the broad adjustment category are previous travel experience, time abroad, personality characteristics, national image, and cultural differences. This multitude of variables does indeed present a problem for study abroad research.

Regarding replication, there have not been enough studies replicated in order to test the methodological validity of previous studies. This has been partly due to questions of cross-cultural differences. Study abroad research is of a cross-cultural nature, but it has been very difficult to replicate studies across cultures because of the cultural appropriateness of certain methods for different cultures.

Multimethod studies have been under-utilized. Many studies have consisted of survey questionnaires and problem checklists and have been lacking in multimethod perspectives (Church, 1982). The SSRC studies and the SAEP are examples of some variety in methods being utilized. These studies were characterized by quantifiable collection of data, complemented by qualitative interviewing and, in the case of several SSRC studies, participant observation.

Few studies have included control groups. Control groups would seem essential if one were interested in finding causality with social-psychological variables, as well as program structure and organization variables. Again, the SAEP study comes to mind with its use of comparison groups.

In reference to the general use of the traditional quantitative paradigm, just as with other areas of social science research, qualitative type studies have not gained wide-spread acceptance in study abroad research. Part of the reason for this is the general skepticism toward qualitative research. Program sponsors are more likely to understand research that can tell them something in few words and in concepts that are quantifiable. This kind of research has been the traditional mode of communication between social scientists since the positivist age dawned.

Instead of seeing the multitude of variables as a problem, methods should be found that, in a way "rejoice" in the variety and number of variables. A more holistic

approach to research is needed, in which variables are incorporated and synthesized in the research findings, rather than trying to isolate variables and use them to make causal explanations. Qualitative research, with interviewing and observation methods in natural settings, provides promise for the understanding of these numerous variables in a holistic manner. By incorporating more variables, the goal becomes understanding, not proof.

Kauffmann, Martin, and Weaver (1992) posited that study abroad represents a new way of learning, in that it synthesizes intense personal learning with academic learning. They wrote that this intertwining of personal and academic learning has eluded measurement by standardized instruments, such as Likert scales and personality inventories. The authors proposed that study abroad research requires a whole new perspective and wrote,

> We suggest that study abroad is the prototype for a new perspective in education, a new approach to learning that is holistic, synergistic, and multifaceted, and that cannot be understood or measured by conventional reductionistic approaches. . . . Study abroad challenges educators and researchers to discover new ways to explain and measure the process of change that is the essence of education (p. 144, 145).

The notion of study abroad being holistic and multifaceted implies the need for more qualitative approaches. Especially in natural settings, qualitative research can take into account a range of variables and look at the variables as interrelated and not bits of isolated information. The emphasis on study abroad being a

process of change implies the need for longitudinal studies, which can look at change as a process as it unfolds over time.

The cooperation of social scientists and administrators can also contribute to solving this variables problem.

If administrators can articulate study abroad goals, and their own constraints, then social scientists can better determine which variables will be of more interest to administrators.

There should be more multimethod studies. Various approaches in the same study can enrich findings and address different research questions within the same study. Reinforcing what I have previously stated, there should be more use of qualitative measures such as observation, interviewing, written records, and life-histories. This is not because I am opposed to quantitative methods. There needs to be a balance between quantitative and qualitative research and thus far most of it has been quantitative. Spaulding and Flack (1976) advocated the use of direct observation approaches.

Morris (1960) had some good writing on the question of quantitative vs. qualitative. He basically saw it not as qualitative <u>vs.</u> quantitative, but as the two complementing each other. His experience with both in a study abroad research context provided a strong advocating voice. He also brought the notion of interaction with the

research subjects into play. He felt that the study he did with Scandinavian students, in which there was more interaction with the subjects (Sewell, Morris, & Davidsen, 1954) was more reliable in its findings than a later study that utilized quantitative methodology (Morris, 1960). In the preface to the 1960 study, he compared the 1954 Scandinavian student study.

> This kind of personal knowledge stands comfortably behind each statement of interpretation made about the [1954] study. . . . I think we are on much shakier ground in trying to make interpretations in the present [1960] study, which lacks this insight into the lives, reactions, and feelings of foreign students.

He went on to distinguish the two studies in terms of their units of analysis. He said that in the more interactive, qualitative study, humans were the units of analysis, whereas in the more quantitative study, the variables were the units of analysis. He felt that both kinds of studies are important, in that each one provides a different kind of understanding. The more quantitative study made the complexity of the experience easier for the social scientist to understand by breaking the experience into measurable conceptual categories. He felt that the more qualitative study gave an understanding that was more useful in understanding foreign students for study abroad practitioners and students.

Bennett, et al. (1958) used questionnaire data and data obtained through interviewing and participant observation to complement each other. They viewed it as a

"reciprocal relationship between the two kinds of data" (p. 5). However, they found that the participant observation and interview data took precedence over the questionnaire data because it was more reliable in investigating actual behavior. "Certain key problems of intercultural experience lie in the content of the behavior itself and not in abstract measurements" (p. 7). The Bennett study consisted of two phases. The first was a study of Japanese sojourners in the States and the second phase was of Japanese returned students in Japan. The return portion in Japan was characterized by more qualitative data collection than the U.S. portion. The authors claimed that the Japan half provided better information overall.

> The returnees, and the more intimate and exploratory approach used with them, supplied better information on the problem of overseas education as a factor in the total life experience. In Japan, meaning was constantly forced upon the research by the subjects themselves; in the sojourner study such meaning was more usually sought by the use of formal hypotheses and by the correlation of measured bits of information. (p. 276)

I agree with their complementary use of quantitative and qualitative data, and their comments are supportive of qualitative and interactional methods, especially given the cross-cultural nature of the research.

The notion of students as participants, and as audiences of research reports, is one with which I agree. There should be more research with the students as "participants" rather than as "subjects". I am not referring to "participatory" research, in which some kind

of social change is the goal. I am talking about "interpretive" research in which students play an active role in contributing their perspective to the data, but not in making decisions about the research design. Participatory research may be something for the future, but at present I do not see its application in study abroad programs as appropriate.

Clarke and Ozawa (1970) put together a study in which the subject was Ozawa, a Japanese student. The report, in which she collaborated, was humorous and insightful, since it was from the foreign student's perspective. Concepts which were found in the literature came to life through the reporting of experiences by the foreign student. This kind of contextual understanding is important in understanding study abroad impacts. Ladd's (1990) study of American students in India is another study that was useful in understanding study abroad. It followed students over the course of the semester and so one could also understand the experience from a developmental point of view. The narrative was interesting and entertaining, and although it was atheoretical, concepts encountered in other studies came alive in real life for these students in India.

If students are involved in the research as active participants, both during the sojourn and after return, it can enhance their own learning experience. Carlson et al. (1990) identified the importance of program provisions for continuous cross-cultural learning opportunities for the

student. I think participation in research of their own program is a sound strategy for this on-going learning to take place.

Qualitative methods, especially in-depth interviewing, would help to enable students to have this kind of participation. Morris (1960) found the Scandinavian students in study responsive to interactive methodology, but the students in a later study distrusted the questionnaire approach.

> This skepticism was directed partly toward the techniques of social science as such, and partly toward what they regarded as typical American superficiality-the lack of depth and subtlety in what we were asking. (preface)

This implies the need for non-quantitative approaches in order to gain cultural appropriateness.

9. Study abroad research has an underdeveloped theoretical base to guide it and this is the largest gap in the study abroad research field.

Study abroad research, for the most part, has been applied and atheoretical (Altbach, 1991). The field needs a sounder theoretical base. The early years of study abroad consisted of studies that were instrumental in beginning a theoretical and conceptual base for study abroad. From the 1970's to the present, study abroad research has stemmed from practical needs and now one of the field's needs is a substantial research base (Carlson et al. 1991). Spaulding and Flack (1976) made the following prophetic sounding statement:

> On the academic side, foreign student research continues to wait for those who may help it recommence where the 1950's and 1960's largely left off-in efforts to build and develop concepts and theories to give purpose and cohesion to the data. (p. 283)

It seems to be still waiting.

A major difficulty in establishing a dominant theoretical base is the multitude of objectives for study abroad programs, with these objectives accompanied by a large number of research variables. The field should not strive for a "dominant" theoretical model or paradigm, but use concepts and theories that already exist in the social and behavioral sciences. In Morris' (1960) overview of the SSRC studies, he wrote:

> Conceptually, the shotgun was also well loaded. As Brewster Smith had pointed out, "Almost any theoretical issue in the sciences of social behavior can be seen in relation to this empirical domain." The cross-cultural educational experience could be seen as a problem of transfer of learning, marginality, attitude transfer, national character, adjustment strategies, alienation, role conflict, or identification- to name only some of the approaches considered. (1960, p. x)

Various other writers have echoed this sentiment (Carlson et al., 1991; Church, 1982; Klineberg, 1976).

This implies that study abroad research should be inter-disciplinary. This makes total sense, as there are social-psychological , anthropological, and sociological theories which can provide a lens for looking at and understanding study abroad. This was done in some of the classic studies. Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) looked at the sojourn period as a time of continued adult

socialization and used "role" as a central concept. Morris (1960) applied the national-status theory from an earlier study abroad investigation (Lambert & Bressler, 1956) in addition to a social stratification theory from the sociology realm. Morris was a sociologist by training. He sought to apply theories in the study abroad context which also would contribute to the larger social science field. It is worthy to note here the famous "U-Curve" hypothesis (Lysgaard, 1955), which has been applied in many studies over the years.

Jacobson, Kumata and Gullahorn (1960) believed that study abroad research had made a convincing contribution to the understanding of attitudes. Cross-cultural studies of attitudes have made three basic contributions to the social sciences: (1) They have delineated national character aspects as well as the fundamental psychological characteristics found in all societies; (2) They have discovered the impact of one culture on another; and (3) They have investigated the way language and culture determine the dimensions of attitudes (p. 206).

Two examples of already existing social science theories which have potential for use in study abroad investigations are social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1962; Homans, 1958) and value-orientation theory (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961).

Social exchange theory views social interaction as an exchange of activity, tangible and intangible, which

results in social costs and rewards. It focuses attention directly on the social process of give-and-take in people's everyday relations. Social exchange theory explains and analyzes the social processes that underlie interpersonal relationships. Group norms guide and shape the social processes of a group, and values influence the creation of group norms. In cross-cultural study abroad programs, different cultural values among group members will influence the establishment of norms. Value-orientation theory provides a useful framework for examining and analyzing the way that cultural values produce group norms and influence interactions.

There may be a new trend in conceptual explanation for study abroad. A promising theoretical framework appears to be that of looking at the experience in terms of development. Spear (1992) suggested using William Perry's (1970) student development model for explaining what happens during the study abroad experience. Very basically, Perry saw the college student moving through a series of stages, roughly from a dualistic view (right/wrong) of the world to a view in which the student recognizes the multiplicity of perspectives that exist. The progression from a dualistic view to a recognition of multiple perspectives reflects a maturation process.

The Perry developmental model has been used for research of higher education students in the United States. A study in which there were an American control group and a

study abroad group would be able to compare the two groups' development. This has been accomplished here in the States comparing control groups and experimental groups who have taken a particular college course. There is already an existing instrument that is used in these studies and perhaps it could be adapted to different cultural groups.

Using the Perry theoretical model and corresponding instrument, researchers could analyze the study abroad experience in terms of its affect on the maturation process of students. Recognizing that multiple perspectives exist is very similar to the differentiated attitude notion that was discussed on page 26 of this dissertation.

Kauffmann et al. (1992) utilized Perry's theory, synthesized with Piaget and Inhelder's (1958) theory, to create a developmental model for the study abroad experience. Their model looked at the synergy of academic and personal change as resulting in increased maturity. Both theories integrate the notion of academic progress being interrelated with personal growth and maturity. The model served as a lens for looking at the study abroad experience in terms of personal growth and maturity. It was excellent in its striving for a conceptual base that took into account several theories and adapted them to the specific study abroad context. The model came to life as they used excerpts from interviews with returned study abroad students. The interview excerpts reflected the changes in maturity and personal growth which the model

articulates. The theoretical model, along with the words of the students themselves, increased one's understanding of study abroad processes and effects.

One other aspect to consider in this social science research discussion is that social scientists in U.S. higher education do not have as well developed an international intellectual community as natural science researchers (Burn, 1980). Natural science researchers have recognized the advantages of doing research in an international context. Burn explained that the more value-related a field is, the less international research has been conducted.

It is not difficult to understand that these value differences are at the heart of international contacts and communication, and that it is precisely these international value differences that may be obstacles to global interdependence. Enlisting social science researchers for more international research, especially that of a collaborative nature, would be a significant strategy toward reaching Mestenhauser's (1982) new international education paradigm. Social science research, with an array of disciplines and topics, could help to flesh out value differences and contribute toward new strategies of overcoming these differences to develop a more cooperative and interdependent world education community.

Summary

Although there have been a large number of investigations in study abroad research, many gaps remain. Research has been characterized by studies small in sample size and limited in scope. Most studies have collected data at one point in time, neglecting the reciprocal aspects of study abroad. Most research has come out of the industrialized, developed nations. There has been too much concentration on attitude studies and sojourner outcomes. The theoretical base is underdeveloped and methodologies have overemphasized the quantitative, traditional paradigm of research.

Study abroad research should incorporate already existing social science theories, from a variety of disciplines, and adapt them to the context of study abroad. This implies the need for social science researchers and study abroad practitioners to work together. More qualitative, naturalistic research should be undertaken. This would increase the ability to investigate processes along with impacts and outcomes. Sample sizes should be small when trying to generate concepts and theory and large when trying to test hypotheses. Longitudinal and post-return studies would contribute to more understanding of the study abroad experience. More studies should be undertaken in developing countries. Study samples should include host and visiting students in order to take account of the reciprocal aspects of study abroad. Collaboration

between host and visiting country researchers would increase the cross-cultural reliability of studies and increase the diversity of conceptual and methodological perspectives of study abroad.

Social Interaction Research

This section deals with foreign student adjustment literature, focusing on the social interaction aspect of adjustment. As explained in the introduction, I came to this as a focus primarily because I am interested in the socio-psychological aspects of adjustment.

Cross-cultural contact, social relationship development, social interaction, and the way these contribute to interpersonal relationship development is dealt with in this section.

The introductory chapter of this paper outlined the relation of social interaction research to the goals of study abroad. The rationale for social interaction research was explicated. The following section goes on to look at what is meant by social interaction and then what the research has found, using the various concepts which have been developed as a framework for investigating the literature.

What Do You Mean by Social Interaction?

Brein and David (1971) recognized the vague use of the term "social interaction" by researchers. It is necessary

to define what is meant by social interaction before readers can understand the meanings of research findings. The authors identified the following "dimensions" of social interaction which can be investigated: (1) Talking to host nationals; (2) Number of people a sojourner talks to; (3) Amount or type of talking; (4) Situation in which sojourner is present but nothing happens; and (5) Number of hosts with whom the sojourner is intimate.

Hull (1978) identified the following "contact variables": (1) Frequency of contact; (2) Loneliness and homesickness; (3) Number of good friends; (4) Nationality of best friend; and (5) Contact through shared lodging.

Selltiz, Hopson, and Cook (1956) conceptualized it in terms of "situational factors": (1) Contact situations; (2) Interaction potential in these contact situations; (3) Amount or frequency; and (4) Quality of contact--
(a) Intimate or not; (b) Friendly/hostile; and
(c) Cooperative/competitive.

Most of the emphasis in these classifications, when they were mentioned in the research report, was on quantifiable measures, such as frequency of contact, number of good friends, and number of people a sojourner talks to. Many studies referred to "contact" throughout the whole study, leaving it very vague.

While quantifiable indicators can be informative, there also needs to be more research on qualitative indicators of social interaction, especially since

increased quantity of contact does not necessarily mean increased positive nature of these relationships. The above factors identified by Selltiz et al. approach this qualitative aspect in their fourth factor of "quality of contact." It is important to understand the qualitative nature of these relationships if researchers are to assess the achievement of empathy and the extent of culture learning. Brein and David (1971) echoed this thinking. "What is most important, then, is not the mere occurrence of the contact or interaction, but instead, what actually happens during the encounter" (p. 223).

Using theories and methods which already exist in cross-cultural communication research and some social-psychological research can contribute to the effective identification of qualitative social interaction factors. Using these theories and methods in a study abroad research context can then in turn inform these other fields' body of research.

Another problem with these classifications is the definitions of such concepts as friends, intimate, and contact. Different cultures define these concepts in various ways. What may be intimate to one culture could be "friendly" to another.

Cross-cultural research collaboration can help to overcome this problem. Complementing the utilization of home and host culture researchers would be the inclusion of both home and host culture students in the study sample.

This would increase the cultural fitness of the investigation.

The remainder of the chapter is a review of literature that has been important for bringing out concepts and theory that help to explain and understand adjustment. These concepts can all be looked at in terms of how the dynamics involved contribute to the development, or not, of positive social interactions. Another way to view it is that the following concepts are variables in the development of positive social interaction and interpersonal relationships. Student antecedent characteristics which contribute to social contact, curves or phases of adjustment, attitude development, national status differences, defense mechanisms, intercultural communication ability, and roles of foreign students are all concepts which, when thought about together, can contribute toward greater understanding of social interaction.

The Student Most Likely to Succeed

Some researchers have sought to identify the kind of student who has effective interpersonal relationships with hosts. Most of these studies also looked at effective relationships as being a function of amount of contact. An aspect of this research is that almost all of this research is based upon foreign students in the United States. From what I have learned, I have put together a composite of the

student who is "most likely to succeed" in interpersonal relations.

1. This will be a young, single student. Younger students will become more socially involved than older students (Deutsch, 1970; Hull, 1978; Scott, 1956). Scott also found that this does not necessarily mean there is more satisfaction with the overall experience. Older students who do not have a large quantity of social interaction may be more satisfied overall because they developed positive interpersonal relationships with students and/or professors in academic and research endeavors. Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) found that these older students, whose contacts were fewer, but of an academic nature, were more likely to have continued contact after return to their home country.
2. The succeeding student's primary motivation for study abroad will be socio-cultural and he/she (nobody has found gender to be an important variable) will be a liberal arts student (Deutsch, 1970; Hull, 1978; Sewell & Davidsen, 1961). Again, this does not necessarily mean more overall satisfaction.
3. The student will be from a European country (Hegazy, 1968; Selltiz et al., 1963) and will be more Caucasian looking (Sewell & Davidsen, 1961). Mishler (1965) found European students to have more interaction than Asian students, but said that it is difficult to

distinguish whether or not this is more related to academic motivation than ethnic or racial factors, since most Asian students are not liberal arts students like those from Europe.

4. The succeeding student will have prior international experience (Klineberg & Hull, 1979).

This kind of information is useful to study abroad administrators and policy-makers. With this kind of information they can anticipate the kind of student who is most likely to be successful in social interaction. They can then make a decision of whether to place recruiting emphasis on students who are more likely to succeed or on students who may have more difficulty in social interaction. Students who have difficulty may benefit more from the overall experience, assuming that the more social interaction difficulty there is, then the more culture learning would need to take place.

Adjustment is Like a Strange Roller Coaster Ride

One of the most used variables in study abroad research has been the U-Curve of adjustment (Lysgaard, 1955) as a way to understand the study abroad experience.

Much has been written on the U-Curve so I will not go into an exhaustive review of the findings. They have generally been inconsistent and disparate. If one does not try to use the U-Curve as a certain predictor of adjustment, but as a model for reference, it can be useful.

It can sensitize advisors to different phases of adjustment and to try and learn from students where they might be in terms of adjustment. The idea that adjustment has certain phases has been the U-Curve's greatest contribution to study abroad research.

A major implication of the U-Curve hypothesis is that study abroad decision-makers need to take into account this notion of phases of adjustment. The U-Curve would suggest that sojourns should not stop when the sojourner is in the downward, depressive stage of adjustment. If they want the student to leave the host culture at a positive point, so that attitudes are positive and there is a general good feeling about the experience, then the sojourn should be long enough to get back to the high point of adjustment. However, the depressive point may be where the most learning is taking place and if culture learning is to be maximized upon return, then perhaps the student should leave at this depressive point. This implies the need for research of returned students, using length of sojourn as a variable and trying to learn the extent of continued culture learning upon return to the home culture.

Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) extended the U-Curve concept to a W-Curve concept which reflected students' difficulty in re-adapting to their home culture upon return. Return studies could perhaps expand upon the extension of the Gullahorns'. Watson and Lippitt (1955) conducted one of the few studies of students both during

the sojourn and after returning home. They found that German students who studied in the U.S. for a year exhibited more learning and a more positive attitude toward the U.S. compared to students who had stayed for six months. However, the one-year stay students had a harder time adjusting back in Germany. Upon return to Germany, the six-month stay students continued changing; questioning and re-evaluating their assumptions. When they did alter their values or behavior, it was in Germany and so it was compatible with the existing German system. This would seem to imply that study abroad decision-makers first of all need more information regarding study abroad effects after return in terms of continued culture learning. Length of stay of programs could be evaluated in this light.

Boy, Do These Students Have an Attitude!

As mentioned earlier in this paper, there has been an excess of attitude studies which assess favorable or unfavorable attitudes (Church, 1982; Hull, 1978; Spaulding & Flack, 1976). As early as 1968 (Walton, 1968) there was substantial evidence in study abroad research that foreign study generally resulted in positive attitudes toward the host country. Positive attitude development as a result of increased interaction has been found in many studies (See, for example, Basu & Ames, 1970; Hofman & Zak, 1969).

Rather than a positive or negative attitude toward the host country, more important is that the sojourner gain a greater understanding of the complexity of other cultures and will then reduce stereotyped images and one-dimensional thinking about another culture. The Useems (1955) stressed the greater need for **comprehension** over **endorsement** of another culture. Researching the processes which influence a differentiated view is needed. A differentiated view can contribute to understanding cultures other than the home and host country of the student. This can help prevent a kind of bicultural provincialism that can result if a student sees the study abroad experience as one in which he/she isolates the host country as "**the** country abroad", to the exclusion of learning more about other countries. The SAEP (Opper et al., 1990) found that this was a general result of study abroad, that stereotypes generally gave way to a more differentiated culture view. Klineberg (1976) emphasized the need for exchange programs to be omnilateral in their impact rather than bilateral.

Bochner (1977) took a cultural pluralist view when discussing the desired outcomes of exchange programs. He believed that the end result of exchange programs should be "mediating men and women." These mediating individuals act as links between cultures and cognitive flexibility is among their traits. They are multicultural in their orientation rather than bicultural. He saw biculturality resulting from sojourners uncritically absorbing values and

technological changes from the host culture, which causes the world to become increasingly homogeneous and less diverse. He considered exchange students who uncritically absorb values and techniques learned in the sojourn as successes from the third world developer's point of view, but the cultural pluralist would consider these students a disaster.

Related to the cultural pluralist discussion is Oyen's (1985) article in which he discussed "marginals" and "centrals." Marginals are individuals who generally have a cultural relativist viewpoint and are more likely to develop relationships with people outside their own membership groups, including foreigners. He saw the marginals as effective cultural mediators. Centrals are ethnocentric and have very tight connections with their own membership groups. They are less likely to develop relationships with foreigners. For cultural diffusion and improvement of international relations to occur, marginals need to effectively interact with centrals in their home culture after the marginals have been influenced by foreigners. Therefore, marginals can only be culture carriers with the assistance of centrals. This perspective sees ethnocentric people as playing a role in creating cultural pluralism.

The notion is fairly simple, yet explicitly articulates the need for people with a differentiated attitude (marginals) to be able to develop relationships

with ethnocentric people (centrals) in order for international relations to be positively affected. This idea seems to point out the need for cross-cultural communication training for returned students, who have developed a more differentiated attitude through their study broad experience.

When comparing the developer and the cultural pluralist perspective, differentiated attitude development fits more with the thinking of the pluralist, while the favorable attitude goal is more in line with the developer's perspective. The developer perspective seems to be located more in the old paradigm of student exchange (Mestenhauser, 1982). For a new paradigm to emerge, the cultural pluralist perspective must be taken. The implication here is that study abroad decision-makers need to be aware of their value position regarding foreign study.

How does cognitive attitude development relate to social interaction? Buchanan and Cantril (1953) found that negative stereotyping was most effectively broken down by first-hand contacts with other cultural groups. Garraty and Adams (1959) found that American students in Europe who failed to make European friends were more likely to exaggerate superficial bad impressions of hosts. As I mentioned earlier in the paper, Kelman (1975) saw cognitive attitude development resulting from learning about the host culture through positive interpersonal relations. This is

consistent with the SAEP (Opper et al., 1990) findings that study abroad usually resulted in this differentiated attitude formation, and that students learned the most about the host culture through conversations with host nationals.

There should be less emphasis on favorable attitude investigations, and more focus on the interpersonal dynamics which affect cognitive attitude development.

My Country 'Tis of Thee

National status differences has been a useful variable. This was a concept originally formulated by Lambert and Bressler (1956) in their study of Indian students in the United States. They found that national status- how Indian students perceived the status of their country in relation to the U.S. and, more importantly, how Indian students perceived Americans' view of their country's status--affected their social interaction with hosts.

The criteria that they established were based upon the American value system (what kind of countries Americans perceived to have high status). A nation with high status is likely to: (1) Be European; (2) Have a long history of national sovereignty; (3) Have well established world power status; (4) Be universally acknowledged as a contributor to world culture; (5) Have a stable social structure; and (6) Have a predominantly Caucasian racial population.

Morris (1960) built upon this concept and studied foreign students at UCLA to determine how national status perceptions affected interpersonal relationship development. He found, as did Lambert and Bressler (1956), that perceived accorded national status (the status the visitor thought Americans assigned to his/her country) had a significant relationship with the amount and depth of social contact. A visitor was more likely to engage in deep friendships if he/she perceived that Americans accorded their nation high status. Ibrahim (1970) and Hegazy (1968) found Arab students avoiding host relationships in which status and cultural referents were strong.

Further supporting this finding was Scott's (1956) study in which Swedish students had an enhanced sojourn experience because of their perception that Americans accorded their country high status.

This has strong implications for interpersonal relationship development. If students avoid relationships with hosts that touch too much upon status referents and cultural characteristics, then the visitor may be limited in the variety and depth of relationships in which they engage. It may also inhibit hosts from learning about the culture of the visiting students, as the visiting student may tend to interact only with hosts whose interests are outside of cultural knowledge.

Eide's (1970) conceptualization of students as culture carriers is useful here. She saw culture being carried and diffused along communication lines. Cultural diffusion is carried out along four basic lines of communication: (1) Home country to student (student's awareness of own culture); (2) Student to host culture; (3) Host culture to student; and (4) Student to home culture upon return (p. 167). Students with perceived low country status have difficulty along communication line two, and therefore an asymmetrical situation is created in which visitor learns about host, but host does not learn about visitor. As most of her research was done in the context of non-Western students visiting the U.S., this conceptualization could help to explain why Americans are not likely to learn about other cultures from interaction with foreign visitors. For Eide, when this asymmetry exists, it is an obstacle to the ideology of reciprocity that she saw existing in student exchange programs.

An off-shoot of national status is the sensitive area complex (Lambert & Bressler, 1955). This is a great example of how theory was built upon. Lambert and Bressler found Indian students to react defensively when perceived negative comments were made about Indian culture or their national status. This defensive or hostile reaction occurred because they perceived the comments of Americans to be hostile, even though the involved Americans' comments were made more from ignorance rather than a conscious

effort to be hostile. Typical defensive reactions were: (1) Developing skepticism toward any favorable impressions they had of the U.S.; (2) Selectively interpreting favorable American practices; and (3) They judged American foreign policy to have unlimited options.

Bennett et al. (1958) found a different kind of defensive reaction among Japanese students in the United States. Their defensiveness resulted from status-cue confusion. Japan is a culture in which cultural cues and protocol are quite homogeneous. When confronted with a situation in which their status and the resulting expected behavior was not clear, they reacted with *enryo*, or extreme reserve. Americans' perception of this reserve is that the Japanese person is shy or socially inadequate.

Watson and Lippitt (1955) studied German students in the United States just after World War II, and found that their identity as losers caused defensive reactions, mostly in the form of increased competition with Americans.

The defensive reactions found in these studies act to inhibit positive relationship development. A tangible benefit of this kind of conceptualization is that it aids one in better understanding foreign students' experience. In the February 18th, 1992 edition of the University of Massachusetts' student newspaper, <u>The Collegian</u>, an editorial was written by an Indian foreign student entitled, "Indian bashing not appreciated." In the last paragraph, he wrote, "I firmly believe that Indian students

in the U.S. are ambassadors of India to the U.S.. I would like to read of the wonderful things India has to offer the world." This Indian student's article put into practical perspective the sensitive area complex concept.

The student mentions having the role of cultural ambassador. Lambert and Bressler (1956) used role as the central concept in their study of Indian students. They found the Indian students to take on three primary roles during their sojourn; Student, Tourist, and Unofficial Ambassador. This study of 26 years ago still has relevance today.

Multiple variables in the foreign student experience can be seen; national status, sensitive areas/ defensiveness, and roles, that all interact with each other to contribute to a better understanding of the whole experience.

The need to conduct post-return research, as I have repeatedly mentioned, is extremely relevant in this area of national status differences. The Useems (1955) found that 90% of the Indian students in their return study reported greater self-confidence and the ridding of any cultural inferiority complex as a result of the sojourn. It is possible that a study abroad evaluation could determine that students had a negative experience during the sojourn because of perceived low national status, and with resulting defensive reactions there was a lack of positive relationship development. If, however, more studies of

students after return had findings similar to the Useems', then again it would have implications for judging the effectiveness of a given study abroad program.

Further research should use the variable of national status, not only because of what it can tell us about the effects of study abroad, but also because it can contribute to the methodology of cross-cultural education research. One of the weaknesses of study abroad research methodology has been the difficulty in replicating studies and generalizing findings across different cultural groups. What is needed is the identification and research application of culture-general research variables. These would be research variables which could be used to classify nationalities and cultures. National status criteria provide one way to do this. Value-orientation, level of homogeneity, and other indicators could be used to find a way to speak of different cultures within the same parameters. Goldsen, Suchman, and Williams (1956) called these "transcultural variables." They claimed that the social scientist should view all cross-cultural contact situations as possible cases for the generation of these variables.

This again implies the need for research among collaborators from different cultures. If these variables are to be definable in all cultures, then it follows that multinational definition is necessary in the beginning. The development of a body of culture-general variables

would contribute to the ability to replicate studies and generalize findings across different cultures.

What We Have Here is a Failure to Communicate

Intercultural communication theory has been under-utilized in study abroad research. As identified earlier, Eide's (1970) lines of communication provided a way in which to view cultural diffusion from a communication perspective. Brein and David (1971) saw the success of study abroad being most dependent upon positive interpersonal relationship development and that this is a function of intercultural communication ability. A positive relationship between host and visitor will develop if visitors can make themselves understood and gain an empathetic understanding of hosts. This is related to Burn's (1985) identification of empathetic understanding as one of the primary rationales for study abroad. Empathetic understanding is a function of communication ability.

This implies the need for more research based upon intercultural communication theory. Nonverbal communication, time and space differences, and value-orientation are among the concepts which contribute to intercultural communication theory. Carlson et al. (1990) identified the need for increased strategies in pre-sojourn preparation and cross-cultural training. Research into intercultural communication could provide more information for formulation of cross-cultural training strategies.

Reciprocity in Social Interaction

There is a need for more research into the reciprocal aspects of study abroad. Reciprocal relationships in which both hosts and visitors perceive mutual benefit from interacting with one another are essential to the success of study abroad programs. More research is needed into the processes which contribute to these mutually beneficial relationships.

Deutsch (1970), in one of the few studies on hosts, found that host families developed a much more positive relationship with visiting students if they perceived the visiting student to be aware of the reciprocal aspect of the relationship, or what the host was going to achieve from the experience. Klineberg (1981) saw that this attempt at developing relationships can backfire if programs try to assist in establishing friendships in an artificial way. If the foreign student perceives this, he/she feels patronized.

What then can contribute to mutual relationships without being artificial? A situation in which there is perceived similarity in goals and problems between visitor and host is most likely to develop a mutually beneficial relationship. The Gullahorns (1963) recognized this as an inherent strength in study abroad programs, that by virtue of the fact that foreign students are there and whoever they are interacting with is there, there is some kind of mutual recognition of similar interest. Buchanan and

Cantril (1953) recognized working toward a common goal as most important in building relationships and in turn breaking down stereotypes. Watson and Lippitt (1955) saw that increased relationship development occurred if Germans and Americans agreed on a problem and were working on it together, even if they had widely differing approaches. The different approaches actually contributed to increased culture learning.

As a characteristic of this relationship, Scott (1956) and Schild (1962) found that active participation, as opposed to observation of, or discussion about problems, contributed to the most culture learning and positive interpersonal relationships. Kelman (1975) recognized that successful interpersonal relationships are contingent upon full-fledged participation in an on-going enterprise.

In addition to active participation around common problems, this notion of on-going or long lasting relationships is crucial in judging the success of interpersonal relationship development in study abroad programs. The on-going relations aspect has the most implications for political effects of study broad and the possibility for study abroad to improve international relations. Kelman (1970) identified four effects of effective and long-lasting interpersonal relationships: (1) They may create greater openness among key individuals in each nation, and hence increase their positive attitude toward the nation as a whole; (2) The level of tension

between the two nations can be reduced; (3) Those who participate may increase their commitment to an internationalist ideology; and (4) Human networks will develop that address common concerns on a continuing basis. This can counteract the tendency of national governments to polarize their international relations. These are all very ambitious and reflect an extremely optimistic view toward the potential of international exchange. Even if one does not agree on the magnitude of the potential, it is difficult not to recognize that there is some kind of potential for study abroad to impact positive international relations.

In order for study abroad research to address these issues of active participation and working toward a common goal, more investigation into the dynamics which lead to these conditions is needed. A key to examining these processes is to simultaneously study host and visiting nationals who develop relationships. This would be better facilitated by collaborations between host and home country researchers and for researchers to be skilled in the native language of both visitors and the hosts.

Post-return studies are needed to address the issue of long-lasting relationships. Post-return research could address another layer of interpersonal relationship development, which is that of reference groups in the home culture. The need for research around reference groups has been expressed (Coelho, 1958; Lundstedt, (1963); Smith,

1956a). Coelho used reference group as the primary variable in his study. Reference groups are the groups in people's lives that, through their expectations, provide an individual with norms and standards for behavior. In a study abroad situation, the student's behavior is affected by reference groups at home as well as reference groups in the host culture. Coelho found that, for the Indian students who were planning to return to India after their sojourn, reference groups in India dominated in their effect over reference groups in the United States.

One common reference group for people is their immediate family. Another is close friends. A sojourner's family back in his/her home country, even though not physically present, can strongly influence choices made by the sojourner. For example, a sojourner may choose to travel somewhere in their host country because it would impress their family, even though travel together somewhere else might have strengthened their relationship with a host national friend.

This makes the study of relationship development in the host culture very complex. Not only does one need to study the host and visiting nationals, but the visiting national's reference groups back home will affect relationship development with host groups. This implies the need to study the visitors' subsequent relationships with home reference groups upon return in order to fully

understand the development of relationships with host culture nationals.

In my review of study abroad literature, the importance of positive interpersonal relations for a successful sojourn was frequently emphasized. Most of this, as with other aspects of study abroad, dealt with the sojourn period. There needs to be increased emphasis placed upon how social interaction affects foreign students after their return. Lasting interpersonal relationships are a key to the accomplishment of improved international relations.

Consistent with this is the need for researchers and faculty members to maintain lasting ties, not only for improved international relations, but to prevent intellectual decay (Goodwin & Nacht, 1986). This occurs when scholars can not apply their new learning upon return to the home culture. This occurs because of cultural differences, technology constraints, and lack of incentives. There is the need for researchers to investigate the effects of social interaction after return.

Summary

Successful social interaction and lasting interpersonal relationship development are important for achieving study abroad program goals. Success in interpersonal relationship development was analyzed using concepts such as antecedent personality characteristics,

phases of adjustment, attitude formation, national status images, sensitive areas of interaction, and mutual reciprocity. Future study abroad research should include social interaction investigations. Conclusions and recommendations in the final chapter of this dissertation are based, in part, upon this literature review.

This analysis of study abroad literature, and resulting research recommendations, set the foundation for the conceptual framework and operational research questions for the Kwansei Gakuin study. The next chapter begins with an outline of the conceptual framework for the study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter identifies and explains the research procedures that were used for addressing the research questions. The study utilized a qualitative, interpretive case study approach. Primary data collection was through in-depth interviewing of both Japanese and North American students at Kwansei Gakuin University (KGU) in Nishinomiya, Japan. Additionally, direct behavior observation was used to a lesser degree. Data collection took place over the course of the 1992-93 school year (September to August). The study was longitudinal, examining the development of interpersonal relationships over the course of the entire school year. Since the study sample included both Japanese and North American students, I worked with a Japanese collaborator, Mr. Yoshitaka Seiya, a Lecturer in KGU's School of Humanities.

The decision for the methodological approach to this investigation resulted from the substantive conceptual framework, In the following section, the conceptual framework is described and a broad outline of the study design is presented, including: theoretical assumptions, study limitations, site and sample, researcher's role, data collection techniques, data analysis, and validity and reliability.

Conceptual Framework and Research Questions

Successful social interaction and lasting interpersonal relationship development are important for achieving study abroad program goals. In past research, success in interpersonal relationship development was analyzed using concepts such as antecedent personality characteristics, phases of adjustment, attitude formation, reference groups, national status images, sensitive areas of interaction, and mutual reciprocity. These concepts, and their interrelationship, provide a study abroad theoretical base for the examination of social interaction. Adding to the conceptual framework of the study were already existing theories in the wider social science field. In particular, social exchange theory and value-orientation theory were useful for this investigation.

Social exchange theory was effective as a sensitizing theoretical framework. However, as the study progressed, this framework diminished as an explanatory tool. Value-orientation theory increased its importance throughout the study's duration.

The research questions, which address the problem of successful interpersonal relationship development, emerged from the concepts generated in the literature review. This relationship is reflected in the following review of the research questions, previously stated in chapter one:

1. How are positive interpersonal relationships defined by the students? Is the definition different between the two cultural groups?

This question first of all reflects the importance of the students' perspective on interpersonal relationships. It helped uncover the reciprocal aspects of social interaction. The concept of reciprocity is significant when viewing social interaction. How actors define the situation contributes to both actors achieving outcomes in the relationship. Differing perceptions of the same phenomenon, due to cultural differences, may lead to communication breakdown. The definition of positive interpersonal relationships may change over time, as students' attitudes become or fail to become differentiated.

2. What types of social interaction produce positive interpersonal relationship development?

Observations within this question area were relevant to some of the dimensions used in defining social interaction. These include interaction frequency, interaction locations, number of contacts, contact context such as participating in joint projects, joint social activities, and doing favors.

This question also addresses the qualitative nature of interactions; intimate or not, cooperative or competitive, friendly or hostile. It also addresses the roles which

students take. Do they interact better as friends, as classmates, as roommates?

3. What factors inhibit or promote social interaction which results in positive interpersonal relationship development?

This question takes into account the significance of home culture reference groups, perceptions of national status, sensitive areas, and antecedent characteristics.

4. What kind of group norms are created as a consequence of the differences in American and Japanese cultural values, and how do these norms modify communication and social interaction processes?

This question emerges from the phases of adjustment notion. The establishment of group norms were affected by the sojourn stage. Value-orientation theory informs as to cultural value categories which can help organize observations, and help analyze which orientations prevail in group development. Individualistic vs. group identity, future orientation vs. past orientation, and directness vs. indirectness are among the cultural value-orientations relevant in this case. Social exchange theory explains the development of group norms as a process which results in equitable and hence positive relationships.

Summary

The conceptual framework provides the rationale for the kind of methodology employed in the study. The

questions and their underlying concepts were a result of the study abroad research literature review described in Chapter 2. The following sections in this chapter describe the research procedure utilized to address the research questions.

Theoretical Assumptions

What is a qualitative, interpretive case study? Merriam (1988) defined it as,

> an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit. Case studies are particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic and rely heavily on inductive reasoning. (p. 16)

The primary purpose of qualitative research is to increase understanding of a particular phenomenon. It is not to test hypotheses or to use results for predicting behavior. The objective is to understand the meaning of the experience, in this case, the meaning of the experience for Japanese hosts and North American students.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) defined the primary purpose of a case study as, "to reveal the properties of the class to which the instance being studied belongs" (p. 371). In this case the class to which the study belongs is social interaction in study abroad programs. The results of this investigation illuminate the nature of social interaction in study abroad programs in Japan so that Japanese and North American administrators can better understand their programs. North American students who intend to study

abroad in Japan will be able to better understand the nature of relationship development. This could result in the establishment of better interpersonal relationships, thus improving language and cultural learning during the sojourn.

This also relates to the heuristic nature of the qualitative case study. If study abroad administrators read the study report, it may extend their experience and knowledge and reveal processes in social interaction which were previously unknown to them. In addition, the language in qualitative case study reporting is more easily understood by administrators and students who do not understand the jargon involved in quantitative research.

Particularistic means that the case focuses on a particular situation, in this case the students and hosts at KGU. Readers of the study can relate this case to cases with which they are personally familiar. The focus on a particular case can also allow a more holistic view of the phenomenon. This holistic approach is particularly appropriate for social interaction in study abroad research.

Because of the multitude of variables involved in social interaction research, a more holistic approach to research is needed, in which variables are incorporated and synthesized in the research findings, rather than trying to isolate variables and use them to make causal explanations. Qualitative research, with interviewing and observation

methods in natural settings, provides promise for the understanding of these numerous variables in a holistic manner. By incorporating more variables, the goal becomes understanding, not proof.

The notion of study abroad being holistic and multifaceted implies the need for more qualitative approaches. Especially in natural settings, qualitative research can take into account many variables and their interrelationship. The case study provides a more holistic understanding of the interrelationship of variables. During the course of my literature review, I found that my understanding of social interaction in study abroad programs was increased more by the small case studies in which variables were formulated on the basis of their interrelationship with each other. For example, national status related to sensitive areas related to attitudes related to interpersonal relationships related to reference groups (Coelho, 1958). The linking of these variables within a single case results in a deeper understanding of social interaction in study abroad programs.

The thick description mentioned in the definition is especially necessary for investigation into a cross-cultural situation. Guba and Lincoln (1981) wrote that thick description means, "interpreting the meaning of... demographic and descriptive data in terms of cultural norms and mores, community values, deep-seated attitudes and notions, and the like" (p. 119).

Merriam (1988) identified characteristics of qualitative research that are germane to the proposed study:

1. Qualitative research is designed for naturalistic settings. It is self-evident that study abroad research can not be accomplished in experimental settings.
2. Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than outcomes or products. In the study of social interaction in study abroad, there must be an investigation over time, examining how processes contribute to the evolution of interpersonal relationship development. The meaning of the experience for participants will emerge through discussion and observation of processes, rather than identifying outcomes.
3. The researcher is the primary data collection instrument. The researcher as primary instrument is appropriate in this proposed study because of sensitivity to context and nonverbal aspects of communication and social interaction.
4. Fieldwork is involved in qualitative research. In order for me to describe and interpret the social interaction in this study abroad program, I needed to have an intimate familiarity with the situation. This required going to the people involved and doing fieldwork.

A qualitative case study is an appropriate method for the building and development of new theory. A purpose of this study was to extend existing theory and build new theory. This theory was developed through "careful examination of the link between social concept and social observation" (Homans, 1950, p. 18). In my study, the social concepts which initially guided observation consisted of the concepts which I outlined in the literature review section. The social concepts included in the data categories of this study guided the ensuing observation and the analysis and interpretation, which led to the tentative hypotheses of this study. Social observation refers to how one learns about the social situation, the methodology for the study.

Theory building depends upon an inductive approach to the study. This study did not test specific hypotheses. As data was collected, tentative hypotheses were made. The research questions which I had initially formulated were based upon the theoretical constructs which I have discussed. These theories, and subsequent theoretical research in which I engaged, sensitized me to areas of potential observation.

Within the qualitative, interpretive paradigm, theory is not used to explain and describe an objective reality. Rather, it is a lens which can be looked through that enables the observer to see the world in a particular way--perhaps a way the observer had not experienced before. The

meaning that each observer derives from this observation depends upon his/her own subjective interpretations.

In the preparation for this study, I utilized existing theory to shape my thought and vision. The tentative hypotheses made as a result of this study are meant to be a lens to look through. The tentative hypotheses are useful if they are looked at as a way of thinking, and that this way of thinking may assist the reader of this study to better understand their own experiences regarding interpersonal relationships in study abroad programs in Japan.

Scope and Limitations of Study

With the intended audience of this study being study abroad administrators in Japan and North America, and North American Japan study abroad students, the scope of the study is primarily that of study abroad programs in Japan for North American students.

A perceived limitation of qualitative case studies is the emergent nature of the research design. This report establishes the basic theoretical framework and describes the study design and course of action which I took. Since the study was contextual in nature, and involved close contact with the study participants, I had to wait until I was on the study site for very specific aspects of the design to become apparent. The design which emerged is quite close to the original plan, but was adjusted to the

realities of the context. This adjustment process worked well, as it kept the study dynamic and relevant to the data analysis which was simultaneously occurring with the data collection.

The cross-cultural nature of this study produced limitations. Even though I collaborated with Mr. Seiya, a Japanese Lecturer at KGU, the analysis and interpretation of the study's data is primarily mine. The writing of this dissertation is solely my own. I realize that the tentative hypotheses I make and the conclusions I draw are filtered through a very Western cultural lens- my own. That is why it is important that the reader keep in mind that I am not producing objective facts with my analysis, but subjective interpretation. The primary purpose is to document the study participants' perspectives. However, there will be some participants who will read this report and realize that what I wrote was not exactly their perspective. The perspective I am trying to summarize is a group perspective on the processes of interpersonal relationship which occurred. My interpretation of the group perspective is meant only to be illuminating and sensitizing, not proof.

I also realize that the documentation of the interpersonal relationship experience in this report is biased toward identifying the barriers to relationship development, that the report presents a fairly negative experience on the part of the study participants. The

study participants, both visiting exchange students and Japanese hosts, basically had a wonderful time during the year of this study. The experience overall was very positive and there were few regrets expressed by anyone. Kwansei Gakuin's exchange program was well developed and executed. It emphasized language and cross-cultural learning and did a good job of providing the conditions for that kind of learning. However, since the primary audience for this report is study abroad administrators in both Japan and North America, and North American students, the analysis and interpretation is presented in a way that can address and help to understand problems. The assumption is that programmers and decision makers' primary responsibility is to improve programming through solving problems. The factors presented which contributed to effective interpersonal relationship development are ones that are perhaps not so obvious, again to increase understanding on the part of readers. Please bear in mind that the whole experience for the study participants was great and that these kind of exchange programs can be lauded and celebrated.

Another limitation was that as the researcher I was largely left out on my own, in a foreign country. My previous experience in Japan was extremely helpful. However, I had to depend to a great degree on my own instincts and abilities. One can never underestimate the

effects of living in another culture and what kind of impact it has on your sensibilities and perceptions.

Researching in another culture influenced my ability to interpret results, given cultural differences. I recognize this as a difficulty and my collaboration with Mr. Seiya helped alleviate this problem. His input made the data collection and analysis more cross-culturally reliable. His presence also was a good venue for me to discuss and process the entire research design and implementation. Without him there my own awareness would have been stifled. Mr. Seiya's English language ability was excellent regarding research content.

There is often criticism that a study in which the researcher is closely involved with the participants influences the processes and outcomes of the situation. While recognizing that this is a possibility, there is not any support in research literature for this assertion (Locke, 1989).

My presence and the study did influence the study participants, to some extent, but I would not say that it limited the study's results. Kwansei Gakuin University's decision and support that allowed me to conduct this research enhanced the exchange students' cross-cultural learning. This study served to increase the participants' awareness of their learning in relationships. The dialogues with me provided students an opportunity to

reflect upon their experience and enhance their language and cultural learning.

Since this study was a single case study, it was not a comparative research project. This may limit the study's illuminative power for some readers. However, just as with the reliability of the study, the comparative aspect of it lies with the reader's past experience. The description and analysis done here is meant to be compared to the individual reader's past experience in study abroad programs.

Site and Sample

Site and Program Description

Kwansei Gakuin University (KGU) was an appropriate site for the following reasons:

1. The University of Massachusetts has an exchange with KGU. I gained entry to the site through introduction by the exchange coordinator at the University of Massachusetts. This is very important for the Japanese cultural context. It is necessary to be introduced by a third, reliable party.
2. I had lived in Japan for two years. I had a basic understanding of the culture and the language.
3. The exchange program is conducive to the study of interpersonal relationship development. It is a full year program in which the American students integrate

into regular Japanese classrooms the second semester. This enhanced my ability to investigate social interaction over time.

4. KGU was committed to the study. The president of the university officially invited me as a Visiting Researcher and the university provided free housing for myself and my family while we were there. They also volunteered Mr. Seiya to act as my collaborator.

Mr. Seiya was asked by his department chairperson to act as my collaborator and host. The chairperson was initially contacted by the Office of International Programs for his assistance. Mr. Seiya was a lecturer, in the process of finishing his doctorate. His area of expertise was ethnomethodology. His specialty area was the ethnomethodological study of child socialization. His background enabled him to be extremely helpful to me. Because of his background in ethnomethodology, he was very good in assisting me with the qualitative methodology I employed. His understanding of research and skill in conducting it was greater than mine. For this reason, I was sometimes not able to incorporate his excellent suggestions.

Mr. Seiya was also instrumental in finding two graduate student interpreters who were excellent in their interpretation skills and cross-cultural understanding. I am very grateful to Mr. Seiya for his time, energy, and

dedication. I sincerely cannot think of a type of person who would have made a better collaborator.

KGU is a Christian-based university, founded in 1889 by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of the United States. Today, the university maintains a student enrollment of over 14,000, with over 500 full-time faculty and staff members. The university has seven schools: Theology, Humanities, Sociology, Law, Economics, Business Administration, and Science. Because of its Christian base, KGU has had an international emphasis since its inception. KGU currently has exchange relationships with over fifteen universities, mostly in Canada and the United States.

The KGU campus is located in Nishinomiya, a residential city with a population of about a half million. Nishinomiya is situated between Osaka and Kobe. Nishinomiya is known as an educational city, because six four-year colleges and universities, and four two-year junior colleges are located there.

KGU's students, as with most Japanese university students, do not live on the campus. In contrast to most North American universities, a residential campus life does not exist. Only a handful of students live in university housing, or near enough to the campus to be considered living "on-campus." Most students live with their parents during their university time. Many have long commutes. This lack of a campus residential life influenced the types

of social interactions that North American students had with Japanese hosts.

All but two of the North American students lived with host families. The two who did not lived in a small dormitory located on the campus.

During the school year of this study, there were 26 exchange students at KGU. Most of the exchange students were Canadian and American. Of these 26, 13 were full-year students, 11 were there for the first semester, and two arrived for the second semester. The school calendar consisted of three terms. There were two full semesters and one inter-term between semesters. The fall semester ran from the beginning of September to the end of December. Winter inter-term was from the end of October to the beginning of March. The spring semester lasted from early April until the middle of July. In the regular Japanese university calendar, the spring semester was actually the first academic year semester. Therefore, when the exchange students began their program in the fall, they were joining in the middle of the school year for the regular Japanese students.

The fall semester consisted of intensive language study, along with a variety of classes from which the students could choose. The non-language courses were all taught by Japanese faculty in English language medium. The non-language courses included the following courses: Government and Politics of Japan, Japanese Religion,

Japanese Business, Early History of Japan, Japanese Psychology, and Social Welfare Issues.

The winter inter-term was devoted to intensive language study. For full-year students, the spring semester was the time for them to enroll in at least two regular university courses (taught in Japanese) and international program courses (taught in English). The number of regular courses taken varied with each student. Some students registered for as many as five, while others took only the requisite two courses.

Social Interaction Settings

There were a number of settings for social interaction from which the data for this study emerged. The nature of these interactions is detailed in chapter four. The following is a brief description of the contexts in which North American students interacted with Japanese host nationals:

1. Host families. The usual home activities included the North American students. Meals, informal chats, entertaining guests, day trips and sometimes longer trips, and watching television together were all activities in which the students participated.
2. University classes. Interaction in classes included both instructors and students. Classes were of two types. International Program classes were the ones in which instructors taught in English language and a few

Japanese students attended. Regular university classes were taken the second half of the program. North American students enrolled in regular courses taught in Japanese language. In addition to social interaction occurring during class, there were sometimes occasions when an instructor invited the students to get together after class at a coffee shop or a restaurant.

3. Informal meetings on campus. Most of the social interaction with Japanese students occurred during informal times on campus. This included chance meetings out of doors and in building hallways. Most students ate lunch in university cafeterias and this provided a good opportunity for social interaction.
4. Outside social activities. North American students engaged in outside social activities with Japanese students, other friends, and host families. These included day and extended trips, dinners, night clubs, sports games and parties in people's homes.
5. University clubs and circles. Clubs and circles are the primary context in which many Japanese students establish and maintain relationships at KGU. Clubs and circles are social groups which bring students together around a common activity or theme. The clubs are a more involved group than the circles. Clubs may require their members to meet every day, for example. Circles' activities are not as intense or frequent.

These groups' activities include sports, traditional Japanese arts and crafts, writing, literature study, foreign languages, and many others. The clubs and circles provide the kind of structure necessary for social interaction in Japan. This need for structure is detailed in chapter four.

6. Employment settings. Many of the North American exchange students worked during their stay in Japan. This happened even though it is against the program's policy, of which they were informed upon arrival. Most of this work took the form of teaching English. This occurred in private schools, as well as on an individual basis. One student was a waitress in a restaurant, and one worked at an international exhibition fair.

7. International Program activities. The Office of International Programs organized social activities for the exchange students to meet Japanese students and faculty. One very effective means for meeting new people was the periodic coffee hours which the Office of International Programs hosted. These would occur late in the afternoon at the Office's "International House". Another effective program was the "buddy" system. The Office of International Programs arranged for each exchange student to be assigned a buddy at the beginning of their stay. The role of the buddy was to assist the North American students in getting

settled and oriented to the university and the town. For most exchange students, this was the first host relationship with a Japanese student.

8. Public chance meetings. Foreigners, especially Caucasians and African Americans, attract a lot of attention in Japan. While traveling day to day, students had many encounters with strangers. There were various forms for these encounters. Sometimes the strangers wanted to practice English. Sometimes they just wanted to get to know the student because he/she was a foreigner. While these interactions did not directly provide data for this study, these experiences affected the North American students' perceptions of their Japanese hosts.

Participant Sample

Throughout this whole dissertation, the names used for the participants are all pseudonyms.

Previously described were the reasons for choosing this student exchange program for the study, and the nature of the site. When I arrived at KGU, I had to decide on which participants within the program would be included in the sample. On one basic level, anyone with whom I talked or observed was in the sample. I was open to any information I could gain while I was there. However, the data which I used specifically to analyze the case were gathered through purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990).

Since the goal of the study was increased understanding, I wanted to select participants who would contribute to this. I looked for participants who were reflective and, given the study's reciprocal foundation, who seemed to be actively seeking interpersonal relationships. This was purposeful sampling--seeking participants who could contribute to the specific research questions.

Additionally, some of the exchange students were in the program for only one semester. Since the study was longitudinal, I selected participants who would be there for the whole year. I also selected Japanese students who would be there for the entire year. March was graduation month and so the seniors, whom the exchange students would get to know would graduate at that time. Therefore, I did not actively seek seniors to participate in the study. However, I did of course talk to some Japanese seniors and some exchange students who were there for only a semester. This usually happened accidentally. People were referred to me or actually asked me if I wanted to talk to them. In a few cases I met an informant in the second part of the school year who I had not interviewed in the beginning. Through talking to them, I discovered that they could give me insights into some of the data which had emerged. Again, this reflects purposeful sampling-recruiting informants who can shed light on the research questions. My policy was to never turn down an opportunity for

gathering information. However, the "core" sample were people who I tried to establish and maintain a relationship with for the entire year.

In this core sample were ten North American exchange students, Canadian and American. One of these students was a foreign national studying at a North American university as a degree student. I maintained relations with these ten students throughout the school year. I was able to do formal in-depth interviews with them all twice during the school year. Most of these ten also participated in two group interviews which I held with exchange students. I also interviewed six of these ten students' host families.

There were eight Japanese students in this core group. These eight Japanese students knew and had a relationship with at least one of the ten exchange student participants. I was able to interview six of these students twice. The other two were interviewed only once, but their insights were so keen in the one interview that their information became part of the core data.

I felt gratitude and affection for all of the participants in the study. They were really great people and the relationship we established was one of mutual respect. The nature of the study itself also contributed to an air of intimacy in our relationship.

Including ten North American exchange students, eight Japanese students, and six host family representatives, the

core sample consisted of 24 participants. See Appendix A for more detailed information about the core sample group.

Researcher's Role/Limitations and Relationship with Participants

I had originally planned to act primarily as a participant-observer. My original design was to participate in many activities and attend most of the exchange student classes. This started out to be the case. I was receiving many social invitations from the exchange students, but could not take advantage of many of them. This was due to the necessity of making a living. I had to work full time and this cut into my time to be a participant-observer. My feeling is that to be an effective participant-observer, you have to do it full-time and be a complete participant-observer. So, while I did observe classes and informal settings and generated field notes, my primary role was as an interviewer. My inability to conduct thorough participant-observation limits the study's depth.

I obtained the students' permission in the beginning and let them know what I was doing. With the exchange students this was accomplished with the help of the Office of International Programs. They invited me to all of the initial group activities with exchange students.

At the first group program orientation I introduced myself and the project. I then asked exchange students to sign up on a sheet of paper if they were potentially

interested in participating. They all expressed interest. I then had as many interactions with them as possible. This would help build trust and relationship, as well as allowing me to observe which students would make good participants in the study.

When informed of the study, some initial comments were, "you mean we are your guinea pigs?", "do you expect students will contact you and talk about their problems?", and "do we all look normal so far?"- all of these comments accompanied with much laughter.

Once I had decided who to ask to participate in the study and had started building rapport with all of them, I had a party at my house. Before the party commenced I had the first group interview. This was done for two purposes. The first was to explain more to them what the project's purpose was, and the second was to be the first formal data-gathering interview. After the group interview we had a party, with other students as well, that went late into the night. This was a benchmark in my relationship with the exchange students.

When I explained the project to them, the situation became quite humorous. When I explained that they would all be referred to with pseudonyms, Neshek asked what his would be and Alan remarked, "Larry, Curly, or Moe?" I made reference to the ambiguity involved in this kind of project when I said, "I haven't really said that much about it yet [the project]. I've been this guy kind of floating

around." One student joked, "It's OK, we still like you." I explained the confidentiality of the study and also identified what would be in it for them--a chance to process their experience and perhaps the dissertation at the end would be interesting for them.

My original plan for recruiting Japanese participants was to ask the exchange students to ask people they had established relations with to be interviewed by me. After discussing this with Mr. Seiya, we thought this would be the most culturally appropriate way to do it. This would also be in following the reciprocal nature of the study. This proved to be a problem for a while. For about two months, nobody was inviting their Japanese counterparts to be interviewed by me. I became worried. The exchange students did not feel comfortable inviting their Japanese friends to talk to me until their own relationship with them was more developed. This made a lot of sense and reinforced to me the necessity for a gradual entry into the project. It did start to happen and then it was fine. In addition to the Japanese students invited by the exchange students to participate, I personally invited some of the Japanese students after I had met them and established rapport. I generally met them in informal settings where they interacted with the exchange students.

My status at the university was known as Visiting Researcher. I was provided a house on the campus designated for visiting faculty, which was where I invited

students for interviews. In this situation, I had relatively high status in the eyes of the Japanese students. This status perception sometimes caused reticence and reserve on the part of the Japanese students. This required some technique adjustments in the interviewing sessions. These are described in the data collection section.

My relationship with Mr. Seiya was very good. He was like a consultant for me. His advice was important for Japanese cultural information which impacted the study's methodology, and gaining entry with the students. His specialty is the ethnomethodological study of child development. He was a good source of information regarding the methodological aspects of the study. His assistance in the interpretation was also very helpful. He helped me understand the Japanese students' perspectives by discussing the data with me in a cross-cultural context. I checked my perceptions and interpretations with him.

Doing interpretive research in a cross-cultural setting presents many problems that the collaboration between researchers from two cultures can help to overcome. Malpass (1977) wrote that one of the major difficulties in utilization of a cross-cultural methodological strategy is "ignorance of the minds of our subjects" (p. 1069). This occurs when a researcher is investigating a cultural group different from his/her own. A researcher investigating subjects from a culture different from his/her own can not

fully understand the behaviors because of lack of knowledge of the social and physical environments in which the subject was raised. If the differences between subject and investigator are great, and the nature and extent of these differences are unknown, then the differences which emerge in the data will be uninterpretable. An explicit exposition of these differences is necessary. This is where Mr. Seiya was a key informant.

Malpass suggested that one approach to overcoming this problem is by collaborating with a researcher who is from the culture of the subjects being investigated. The cultural differences can then be illuminated and the data will be interpretable for readers in both cultures.

My experience with, and understanding of Japanese culture, enabled me to effectively communicate with the Japanese students. Being aware of cultural values and behaviors aided me in my initial contact with students. Mr. Seiya's input was additional information which helped me to establish relationships with the Japanese students.

Earlier I wrote that the effect of my presence and the study's methodology did affect the participants and the study. There were several aspects to this.

On one level, the participation by the students in the project was appreciated by them. They did benefit from having a venue to process their learning and it seemed to enhance both their learning and their mental well-being, in terms of stress reduction. Margaret remarked, "It was

really nice having you here. It kept us sane." Jane referred to both the learning aspect and the mental well-being:

> I kind of like having you here, because it is sort of a constant reminder of perspective , kind of like you're forced to think about it in sort of an objective, general way. . . If you start feeling lonely or something like that, it's an easy way to get out, you know be like well it's just perfectly natural to feel this way.

This effect of my presence was felt by most of the exchange students.

I also feel that the tentative hypotheses of the study and the overall tone of the report were more negative than the reality of the situation. I mention this in the beginning of the next chapter. The entire report is basically from a problem-solving perspective. Since the intended audience of the report is study abroad administrators this is natural. However, I think the methodology also influenced the report to have more of a negative tone, in terms of the interpersonal relationship development of the study participants. Sean articulated the cause of this well:

> I think it's a fair reflection of what we've talked about [member check paper]. I just, I think also there's a tendency when you talk, this a bad point and it's something I'm guilty of as well. It's when two Westerners get together and talk about what's happened in Japan since September it invariably goes onto the strange behaviors we've seen, the funny people we've met, and instances that we've acted really stupidly and the instances that other people, Japanese, have acted really stupidly. So it doesn't revolve around the great experiences that we've had. I think that will happen a lot when we

return to our home country. We'll sit there and think what a great time we had.

So, at the same time this worked as a venue for processing the experience, the natural inclination was to process the negative parts of it, the barriers. This influenced the study's results.

Data Collection

Primary data collection techniques were in-depth interviewing and direct behavior observation of both Japanese and North American students.

As the research questions indicate, processes, not outcomes, are the focus of the study. Student perspectives are crucial and the study's purposes are description and interpretation. Direct behavior observation and in-depth interviewing are the most appropriate techniques of collection for data related to processes, student perspectives, and the resultant description and interpretation.

The two techniques complement each other, and the utilization of both increase the trustworthiness of the study. Interviews can be used to obtain data which can not be collected through observation, such as feelings and thoughts which participants do not verbalize in public. Observational data can be used to check verbal data obtained in an interview. As I wrote earlier, I conducted direct behavior observation, but not to a great extent.

Direct Observation

As an observer, I had some close interaction with the students participating in the exchange program. I interacted with students primarily in classes, formal program activities, and informal gatherings in the campus area. These informal gatherings were on "the green"- the large open field in the middle of the campus, in campus building hallways, restaurants and bars, the campus cafeteria, and coffee shops. Formal program activities included coffee hours sponsored by the Office of International Programs, program meetings and orientations. The remaining part of the discussion on observation will cover rationale of this technique, relationships with participants, content of observations, and observation procedures.

Direct behavior observation is an appropriate data collection technique for gaining an understanding of the participants' experience. The study is interpretive and therefore requires "thick descriptions" of the environment and interactions of the involved actors. Geertz (1973) articulated the role of thick description in the interpretation process. "A good interpretation of anything- a poem, a person, a history, a ritual, an institution, a society- takes us into the heart of that of which it is the interpretation" (p. 18). The way to the heart of the matter is thick description.

My role was totally overt. I openly informed students of the study and my role as observer. This was a concern among the exchange students at first. They made jokes about me carrying a hidden microphone or acted out a surreptitious meeting when seeing me in hallways. I also avoided taking on any other roles at KGU that might conflict with my role as observer or interviewer. This is especially important in Japan where status according to one's role plays a much larger part than in the United States. For example, if I had taken a teaching position at KGU, it would have jeopardized my ability to establish an interactive researcher role with the Japanese students. The high status accorded to teachers might have caused the Japanese students to be inhibited in their interactions with me. Even though my relatively high status as Visiting Researcher required some interview technique adjustments, not being an instructor helped limit the problems in getting good participation in interviews.

The content of observations flowed out of the research questions. Since the focus of the study is on social interaction, my observations were focused around any interactions between participants in the study.

Wilson (1977, p. 255) identified five types of relevant data that are used to get at meaning structures; (1) form and content of verbal interaction between participants, (2) form and content of verbal interaction with researcher, (3) nonverbal behavior (4) patterns of

action and nonaction, and (5) traces, archival records, artifacts, and documents. Meaning structures can be defined here as the students' perspectives. The content of my observations was framed by Wilson's first four criteria.

Since this is a case study, the context which surrounds student interactions was important to describe and document. Patton (1990) identified several sources for the collection of data, which will help to describe the context; (1) The program setting, the physical environment, (2) the human, social environment, (3) planned program activities and formal interactions, and (4) informal interactions and unplanned activities. I utilized all of these sources.

The actual procedures used in collecting data through observation were the following:

1. Since the study is longitudinal, the first stage, perhaps a month, was used to establish relationships with the participants. I attempted to develop trust and gain the involvement of participants in the study. This included describing the study and gaining the students' participation commitment through them volunteering to participate.

The establishment of close relationships with the participants was important when interpreting the study data. I employed the technique of "member checking" with the participants. This involved feeding back my tentative interpretations of collected data to participants and

receiving their perspective on my interpretations. I did this with a structured written instrument and also during my second interview sessions with participants (see the member check document in Appendix B). Whyte (1955), in a discussion of the participant observer and participant relationship, observed, "Some of the interpretations I have made are his [a participant] more than mine, although it is now impossible to disentangle them" (p. 301).

2. Once participants were identified, trust established, and data sources and locations identified, I began the systematic collection of data. After an observation episode, I immediately recorded field notes on my word processing program. The field notes are the crux of the observational data. Bogdan and Taylor (1975) list some suggestions for effective field note utilization:
   a. Look for key words in subject's remarks. In my initial data collection, I listened for key words and phrases that are related to the research questions and conceptual framework.
   b. Concentrate on first and last remarks in each conversation. This assisted in remembering the whole conversation. These first and last words were jotted down at the time they were said.
   c. Leave the setting as soon as you have observed as much as you can accurately remember. It is counter-productive to stay longer than this period of time. I practiced this also.

d. Record your notes as soon after the observation as possible. My residence was on the campus. Since most observations occurred on campus, this was possible. This procedure required a lot of discipline, but I found it made a huge difference doing this.

e. Do not talk to anyone about your observation session until you have recorded field notes. Doing so would cloud the memory. I learned that this is very important.

f. Draw a diagram of the physical layout of the setting and attempt to trace your movements through it. This will aid in recalling events.

The form of the field notes included a margin for researcher comments. Besides commenting on the substance of the data, and my own interpretations, the margin included space for my comments on the methodology. This allowed me to reflect on the methodology and adapt it if necessary. The methodological comments were later recorded into a separate methodology journal, which I consulted regularly.

The school year at KGU is divided into three terms--the fall semester, a winter inter-term, and the spring semester. The first semester, in the fall, had the North American students studying language and attending classes which are taught in English. The spring semester the North American students attended some courses taught in Japanese,

as well as their exchange student program courses. Within each period, I did more direct behavior observation in the beginning weeks, until I received diminished results from the observations.

I found participant-observation valuable. It enabled me to cross-check some of the data I had gathered through interviews. Sometimes people's behavior did not match their spoken perceptions in an interview.

I also found participant-observation to be hard work. Sometimes I spent many hours with participants and had no real observations occur. It was best in these situations to go with the flow and have fun with what was happening at the moment.

Interviewing

This section on interviewing is discussed in terms of rationale, content, and procedures.

The primary purpose of qualitative, open-ended interviewing is "that the persons being interviewed respond in their own words to express their own personal perspectives" (Patton, 1990, p. 287). In an interpretive study it is necessary to obtain the perspective of the participants, in their own words. Effectively addressing the research questions depends to a large extent on uncovering the perspective of the students. The data gained from the North American students was around the same

content area as with the Japanese students--interpersonal relationships.

Interpersonal relationship development consists of the feelings that people have for other people. Interviewing is a technique which can obtain data around feelings. This kind of data often does not emerge in public, observational settings.

The content of the interview questions emerged from the research questions and the conceptual framework. Since the study had a fairly specific focus, an open ended interview guide approach was used. Open ended questions allowed the participants' perspective to be verbalized. The interview guide helped to focus the interview on social interaction and the concepts used in framing the study. The questions were not standardized, especially given the cross-cultural nature of the interviews, but were designed to elicit data which contributed toward answering the research questions.

Patton (1990) identified six basic types of qualitative interviewing questions; (1) behavior/experience questions, (2) opinion/value questions, (3) feeling questions, (4) knowledge questions, (5) sensory questions, and (6) demographic/background questions.

I used all six types of questions during the interviews and the type depended upon when the interview was conducted. The following describes some interview

procedures, including time spacing of interviews, types of questions asked, and some interviewing techniques.

In order to take into account the developmental nature of interpersonal relationships, I conducted two formal interview rounds with the core sample. The time span of the study was September to August. During the one year of the study I conducted a total of 54 formal in-depth interviews. Each interview lasted between 90 and 120 minutes. I audio recorded each interview. My house was a university visiting scholar residence on-campus, and this is where I conducted all of the interviews. This logistical detail helped immensely in the interview procedures. As mentioned earlier, all of the interviews did not yield data that was useful for the study.

The first interview round took place as soon as participants were identified. These formal interviews were conducted between the end of October and the beginning of December. This round included one exchange student group interview, 17 formal exchange student individual interviews, and 14 individual Japanese student interviews.

The second interview round took place between the middle of the second semester and the end of the school year--June through August. This formal interview round included ten of the same exchange students interviewed in the first round, six of the same Japanese students interviewed in the first round, and six interviews with members from six different host families.

These two rounds were formal in-depth interviews and do not include the informal interviews which frequently occurred and their data included in my field notes.

As previously mentioned, the interviews were done with an open-ended interview guide. This meant that all of the interviews started from the same framework which sprang from the research questions, but allowed flexibility for the interviewees to give their perspective on what they considered important in interpersonal relationship development. The exchange student interview guides were developed by me. For the Japanese interviews, I made the content of the questions correspond with the exchange student interviews, but the wording of the content was sometimes different. This was decided upon through discussions with Mr. Seiya. His input helped me to make the questions more culturally appropriate and resulted in better responses from the Japanese participants.

Some of the Japanese interviews were conducted by me with the participants in English. For the participants who did not have good English ability, I was assisted by an interpreter. Mr. Seiya recruited two different interpreters for me. The interpreter I had the first semester was Ms. Tamiko Mogami. The second semester Ms. Nami Kawamoto helped out. They were both students at KGU and had both studied in North America on KGU exchange programs. Their assistance was extremely valuable. They were able to do a good job because of their cross-cultural

understanding and they were both extremely bright. During the course of interviewing, they were able to work with me on improving interview procedures and techniques as well as interpreting difficult cross-cultural nuances.

Even though the two interpreters were very helpful, there were of course some problems and limitations in doing the interviews with an interpreter. It would have been ideal if my Japanese language ability had been good enough to do the interviews in Japanese myself.

The first problem, which was also a problem to some extent in my interviews with Japanese participants in English, was the didactic tone these interviews tended to take from the start. I wanted to get perspectives, but found people giving me answers. In chapter four, the concepts of faculty-student status, and *honne/tatemae* are discussed at length. The underlying interaction dynamics of these concepts were also factors in the interviews I had with some of the Japanese students.

My status was perceived as being on a faculty level. Japanese students are accustomed to a didactic relationship with faculty and so this carried over in the interviews, especially in the beginning. The students tended to give me short answers to my questions, and did not evoke much data. Along with this is the notion of keeping things harmonious (*tatemae*) and saying what they thought I wanted to hear. This is all fleshed out in chapter four, but the result in the interviews at the beginning was that the data

was shallow and superficial. Obviously, this is not the desired result when you are after perspectives.

Individual perspectives were difficult to come by in a culture where group identity, harmony, and status are all important. Perspectives have parallels to opinions. The reticence in Japanese culture to give a personal opinion carried over to giving a perspective. This is one reason that Mr. Seiya advised me that a group interview would not work with Japanese participants. The individual interviews did end up yielding some perspectives. With the help of the interpreters we tried a few techniques that worked.

One simple technique was to engage in some small talk in the beginning to set the climate. Another was to not have direct eye contact with the interviewees when they were considering a question. The interviewees were quite thoughtful before responding to the questions and I did not look directly at them while they were thinking. This increased their comfort level. One other thing we did was simply explain to the interviewees in the beginning of the interview that we did not want simple answers and that we were after their own thoughts. Once we employed these techniques the perspectives came more freely.

Another problem which came up was the language issue itself. This was related to status. In Japan, as in most countries, speaking a foreign language is considered quite skillful. In Japan, where students study English for many years in school as an academic subject, not many Japanese

people speak English with any kind of functional fluency. So, those who can speak with fluency attain a type of high status based upon their language ability. Therefore, we occasionally had interviewees who thought their English language ability was good enough to do the interview in English, even though it was not nearly good enough for an in-depth interview. This problem was exacerbated when the student was a male who was older than the female interpreter. They would say something like, "just translate when I don't understand." This presented problems on a few different levels. One was that they usually would not say when they did not understand. Another was that there would not be any kind of "rhythm" to the interview. The third problem was that their English language responses were not nearly fluent enough to express a meaningful perspective.

I was familiar with these problems from having worked in a training program using interpretation. Therefore, I was able to foresee these and they only occasionally caused a problem. I explained at the beginning of interviews that it would work well if we translated even small responses. Even if I understood the Japanese in a response or if the respondent understood my English language question, the ground rule was that the interpreter interpreted everything. This limited the ambiguity and provided for a smooth flow and rhythm to the interview.

As in any interpretation situation, much depends upon the interpreter. To maximize the reliability of interpretation, we always had a de-briefing of the interview afterwards. During this time, we could process the procedures as well as clarify difficult aspects of the language interpretation.

A summary of the contents of the formal interviews follows. The following interview questions were formulated first in an interview guide prior to each interview. What I have recorded here is taken from interview transcripts. This way there is a feel for how I actually asked the questions. These questions do not include follow-up or probing questions. These are only questions as they were first formulated in the interview guide.

Interview Questions for North American First Group Interview.

1. I'd just be interested in you telling me how you got involved in the program, you know, what your background is and getting involved in this program and your reasons for coming here.
2. I'd be interested in hearing about what your interactions with Japanese people have been like this you know this first month. Whether it's been with your host family or dorm mates or ah, not your girlfriend (laughter), or Japanese students, the buddies that you had or other students you may have met, or people in general, people in public that you

see. You know, just what has struck you about your interactions with people in Japan thus far?

3. How have things with host families been in general?

Second Group Interview with North American Students.

I start out the interview by referring to the member check document that they had all read. This document related my interpretations of the data I had received up to that point.

1. This was just a very small portion of all the stuff. It was just supposed to bring out some points that you know other comments also brought out that. What was your reaction? Did it stimulate some kind of thinking about anything?
2. One thing that's been with a few people, I don't know, but now everybody, it's been a big part of the experience, it's been hierarchy, the hierarchy in Japanese society. Has that been a part of your experiences and if so, was it any different from in there [the member check document]?
3. How about around motivation? Have you gathered anything about, I mean what came out for me in listening to Japanese folks and you was um oh it's partly this give and take and it's partly motivation, well everything is hopefully tied together um but that a lot of people's motivation to know you all is that they're going to be maybe traveling later. They might some time go to Canada or North Carolina.

4. There's an element coming from Japanese people though too, you know on the side of, if they do hang out with you all that they're outstanding (sticking out) to other Japanese students. You know, whether it's prestigious or not, there isn't that kind of value judgment on it, but somehow people really look at them and notice them a lot and notice them if they hang out with you all.
5. If you were to characterize your interpersonal relationships with Japanese people, how would you characterize them in five minutes or less and how would that characterization be different now than it was last you know the end of September or October?
6. Let me ask you this. When you first came here, were your expectations about the kind of interpersonal relationships you wanted to develop any different than they are now?
7. Let me ask you one last question for sure. You know this new term that you started in April, you're in regular Japanese courses. You know, how has this affected your experience here? In any way, in terms of academic or interpersonal relationships?

First Individual Interview with North American Students. These individual interview questions varied somewhat depending upon who I was interviewing. However, the nature of what I was trying to elicit was basically the same with everyone.

1. I just wanted to follow up on that group interview. If I followed you or if some magical person followed you around on a typical day, today or tomorrow, just an average day, what would they see in terms of your interactions with Japanese people? You know whether it's students, host family, instructors, international office, what would that look like?
2. How are you relating to Japanese culture? What's striking you about Japanese culture?
3. Let me ask you another question. You're going back to the States in July. So imagine you're back there, and I ask you this question at that time, which I may very well call you or write to you, and say ah, so now looking back on the relationships you had with people in Japan um what were they like, I just kind of asked you that general question - what was your relationship with Japanese people like? What would you ideally like to answer at that time? Looking back on it, how would you feel satisfied about your relationships in Japan?
4. Let me ask you one more question here. Do you think that this experience here in Japan, in general, and also specifically with the kind of relationships you develop with people or not, is going to affect your relationships with friends and family back in the States?

5. With your host family, what do you think they are getting out of, uh, having you, as a host, I mean what's their motivation for having you as a host student?
6. The time is about up so is there anything else, knowing what I am trying to do, anything else you think I'd be interested in hearing about?

Second Individual Interview with North American Students.

1. Since you arrived last fall, how would you characterize your interpersonal relationships and social interactions with Japanese people since that time? What's changed?
2. One of the things in there [member check document] was this thing having to do with opinions, one of the barriers to getting to know people better or forming close friendships is the difference in the expression of opinions or not expressing opinions. In your first interview you had expressed wanting to know what was on people's minds, what their passions are, you said all this stuff, has that been, what do you think about that, has that been part of your experiences and is it the same as it used to be or has it changed?
3. Well did you find I mean over the course of the time you've been here, I mean this theme comes up with all of you, this sort of superficial conversation, and it's quite clear that Japanese college student group

norms anyway are, ah in that paper [member check document] there's like *hanashi ga au*, you know, all the topics have to fit together and *meiwaku o kakenai*, don't say anything that upsets the balance or something. I hear this you know from everybody. Did you try any kind of strategies or did you notice anything that I mean did you try to when you were interacting with people to get past that or did you just accept it and like you said interact more with people who have interacted with western people?

4. What was your experience with clubs?
5. Do you ah, that theme has kind of come up in a number of interviews ah it's this feeling of uselessness or being a burden on somebody. You know a lot of it I guess comes about because people are always kind of putting out these helper feelings and things like that. Have you, I mean besides the situation in your club, have you felt that kind of thing in other situations, being a burden or being useless, or has it changed more as time has gone on?
6. If you were in situations and you didn't feel like it was a mutual giving back and forth, did you do anything to compensate for that or did you generally find yourself getting out of that?
7. You remember in the beginning, ah this was something that came out a lot in the beginning was this feeling that this phenomenon of people always saying I want to

become friends with you and I want to do this and do that but then sort of it was just left hanging and nothing was ever followed up on. Did you ever figure that out or did you ever see anything like that change?

8. I had the feeling sometimes, like sometimes when I was talking to people I felt, my feeling was that things sounded overly positive you know, as far as relationships with people and I don't think it was in a conscious way but I was just wondering if somehow my presence and my questions you know if it made people feel like you know however they responded, not because of me necessarily, but just the questions I was raising, however their response was, was going to be a reflection of whether they were succeeding or not, you know was there an element of that at all?

9. How were your interpersonal relationships here and the ones that worked, how was it that they worked and the ones that didn't, um you know what happened that they didn't necessarily work?

10. [discussing North American university students] You know they have a lot of intellectual conversations, not only with people in their own classes but you can talk to somebody else about a class and you know and a lot of perhaps your self-esteem also going on with that identity comes from ah intellectual, academic performance is always there whether you get a good

grade or not, but I'm talking about the substantive you know... So then what I'm wondering is if here if that's the case, when you come here there's zero of that [intellectual stimulation/discussion], I mean for Japanese students also. They don't come to a university to do that... So ah does that affect, do you have to compensate for your identity and ways that you build esteem in other ways here?

11. If you were talking to a North American student coming here to study next year, what advice would you give them regarding development of interpersonal relationships with Japanese hosts?

12. Another barrier [to interpersonal relationship development] seems to be the constantly and forever being a guest and you know the opposing desire on the part of North American students to fit in and live the life and get to know the people... What have you found with this guest idea, either with students or your host family?

13. How has enrolling in regular Japanese classes changed your relationship with Japanese students?

14. Well, what do you think about higher education in Japan, or more specifically the program here... and how has the program here and the overall education system affected your experience here?

15. Well that was something that came from Japanese students that I talked to, that it takes a lot of time

to develop relationships, you know having experiences together, to create memories together, that's important. To see what somebody is like in every situation.

16. How have your views of Japanese culture changed as a result of your relationships here? Is there anything about the aspects of culture here that you like or don't like, that you've adapted or not?

First Individual Interviews with Japanese Students.

1. Today, basically I'm trying to get any kind of information about any kind of interactions you've had with exchange students, including Sean... I have some basic questions to guide our discussion, but I'm basically interested in what's on your mind. So if there's something besides the question you want to say, please say it.
2. So if I asked you just basically, you've known Sean for two months. What kind of interactions do you have with Sean? Where do you interact, and what do you do, and what do you talk about? You know, what are your interactions with Sean like?
3. How did you first meet Sean? Did you meet him before he joined the club or did you meet him after he came to practice?
4. If you think about practice or the meals after practice and you think about interactions with Sean and you think about interaction with Japanese members

of the club, what's different about the nature of the interactions, besides language?

5. What do you think, now Sean came to the archery club and said he wanted to practice with the club. What do you think his motivation was to participate with the archery team?

6. I'm seeing you and all of the Japanese teammates. Does everyone on the team interact with Sean equally, and if not, what's the motivation for some of the Japanese teammates to interact with Sean more than others?

7. Now, another question. Of course, Sean is North American and you are all Japanese and North American culture, like beliefs, values, behavior, customs, is different from Japanese culture of course. So how is it in the archery club, does Sean act completely like Japanese people would or do you all change a little bit when Sean is around, so the cultural characteristics, who changes, or who doesn't or don't you notice it?

8. Is there any kind of, so I know in Japan, gift giving and receiving is important in wider Japanese culture, so in the archery club, has there been any kind of outward gift giving or receiving, or giving things or receiving things among club members and if so, has Sean done that the same way as everybody or not?

9. Next August, after Sean leaves, if I asked you this question, what kind of relationship do you have now with Sean? At that time what do you hope to be able to say? In other words, do you hope to have contact with him, and if so, what kind of contact?
10. Because of your interactions with Sean, are your interactions with other members of the archery club any different? Or are your interactions with anybody else different? Through your interactions with Sean, have your interactions with any other Japanese people changed?
11. Why do you want to get to know Sean? What's your motivation to get to know Sean?
12. If another foreign student wanted to join the archery club next year, and if he asked you, what are the most important things for me to remember to be able to fit in with the archery club, what would you say?
13. That's all the specific questions I have. Before we stop, is there anything else that you think might be of interest to me regarding your relationship with Sean?

<u>Second Individual Interviews with Japanese Students</u>.

1. Since I saw you last fall, have you been spending time with any of the exchange students?
2. Have there been any incidents that have caused you to get to know any of the exchange students better?

3. How has your relationship with Jane changed in the last six months?
4. I heard that Harry tries to speak a lot of colloquial Japanese. How does that sound when a foreign student is speaking colloquially?
5. I feel more hesitation even among Japanese people than other cultures you know [to speak English] and I'm thinking one of the reasons is that because you studied it so much in school and you associate school learning with intelligence or you know and you assume because you had it in school you should be able to speak it, you know. I mean do you think that's part of the hesitation of people in taking more risks in speaking English? Because one of the things is they always seem to ask the same questions you know. But I'm just wondering if, maybe, they could ask other questions but they're just afraid of making mistakes outside of easy English.
6. I had heard from some Japanese students that they felt intimidated or inferior to the exchange students. I mentioned this to the exchange students and they were surprised and didn't like this situation. How can the exchange students break this down so it doesn't happen?
7. One of the bigger issues for exchange students is feeling like a guest you know in Japan. Westerners just kind of want to fit in and be informal and

independent. They don't want to be treated like a guest and have everybody do everything for them. Um what do you think about that?

8. You know in Japan there is always a hierarchy in any situation you're in so I'm thinking now as you're saying this that perhaps for a host family or other Japanese people, that's one way to put a foreigner in the hierarchy [treat as guest] because where else could they be?

9. Also it seems that the hierarchy might be related, well hierarchy or role, maybe they're all interrelated but you know in the beginning of the stay here when exchange students first met other students or well, not so much the host family, but other students mostly in Kwangaku, some of the typical first interactions are, the Japanese student will say something like please teach me English or I'd like to help you or I'd like to show you Kyoto or something. So it takes on this feeling similar to the guest, it takes on the feeling of either I'm helping you or you are helping me. What I'm thinking is maybe the Japanese student isn't interested in going to Kyoto or learning English maybe even, but in some way that makes a reason for the relationship, like they want to get to know the exchange student, but like in North America you can just get to know someone, you know hey let's talk. But in Japan you need some reason, you know there

needs to be some structure, so you know like teaching or helping. Do you think that's so?

10. The North American students had been talking about the initial invitations they ah have been receiving. People will ask them to do a lot of things and then not follow up on it, which made them frustrated. What's going on there?
11. What's been your observation with this group [in terms of cultural adaptation] and what do you think should be done in terms of adapting to the culture?
12. I mean the Western way sometimes [to get to know someone] might be more like um instead of asking personal questions, we ask questions that require an opinion. Because in that way it keeps our individuality and it's sort of neutral in a way because we don't think of opinions as disrupting harmony or something. So it's a way to get to know how people think, by not being personal.
13. What advice would you give to new exchange students to help them develop good relationships in Japan?
14. Can you explain how that happens? uh What's the relationship between *tatemae/honne* and expressing opinions?
15. If you don't make things smooth and if you use *honne* you know well what's wrong with, why not use, why not just talk about these problems and recognize them and have a conversation about them you know?

16. And then there's this notion of exchange. You know like exchange is a big part of Japanese culture, the way you interact with people. Um connected to this is obligation. Every culture has give and take you know in relationships. But in Japan it's more formal even you know. You know you have gift-giving season and all these things you know. um so mm.

Host Family Interview.

1. You mentioned ah that students are you know coming here and they want to learn about Japan so that they can adapt ah but did you notice any mm Japanese behaviors or ah values that um Mary or the other students had a hard time adapting to?
2. um What was your motivation for wanting to be a host family?
3. Now if I asked you to try and describe um the relationship you had with Mary when she first came you know last September October and then to describe the you know relationship two weeks ago before she left, how would it be different? You know, in other words, how did the relationship change over the course of nine months?
4. Yea it's interesting what you say about the open minded aspect because um well kind of related to that is ah the difference that I you know that I hear from Western students that you know that Japanese people and Western people express opinions differently you

know and sometimes Japanese people are frustrated because ah you know foreign people express their opinions too strongly and ah they're too aggressive and that kind of thing and then Western people say well ah they're frustrated because Japanese people don't say their opinion in a group situation um so ah would you , well first of all what do you think about that in general and then was this open minded ah thing you were talking about connected to that at all?

5. What do rules, like the curfew, mean? Or are they just a form of *tatemae*?
6. Some of the exchange students ah felt that they were being treated as guests, even in their home stay you know so how did you view the situation, did you try to treat Sam as a guest?

In looking at the interview questions, a few things are of note. The first round interview questions were geared more at background and initial data generation. The second round questions got more into feelings and opinions. The second round questions also included my interpretations and tentative hypotheses, so that the participants could react and give their perspectives, thereby contributing to the interpretation of data.

I did not ask questions in sequence in either round of interviews. The interview guide was formulated before the interview took place and I kept it in front of me during the interview. The sequence depended on which question

felt right in the flow of the conversation. One can notice in the questions that some are not questions at all, but statements meant to elicit a reaction. One can also see the almost rambling nature of the questions as they were asked at the time of the interview. That is how we sound when we are carrying on a natural conversation, which the interviews attempted to do.

Data Analysis

Introduction

With a full academic year of collecting data through observation and interviews, there was an incredible amount of data to process and analyze. Data analysis is complex and time consuming. Since the purpose of this study was to increase understanding of interpersonal relationship development between Japanese hosts and North American students, my data analysis was directed toward that goal. My purpose was consistent with Bogdan & Taylor's (1975) idea of the purpose of qualitative data analysis, "formally identify themes and to construct hypotheses (ideas) as they are suggested by data and to demonstrate support for these themes and hypotheses" (p. 79).

As data were collected and analyzed, certain patterns, or themes, emerged. These thematic concepts then had to be organized so that their interrelationships could be examined. The final organizational scheme resulted from

many changes and a slow evolution as the analysis process unfolded.

The themes were organized into two conceptual constructs. Hierarchy and Friendship are the two conceptually "abstract" categories. Each of these two categories is comprised of several "properties." Properties are the conceptually less abstract concepts from which a category is made up. For example, Guest Syndrome and Student Identity are two of the properties that comprise the Hierarchy category.

The interrelationship between the categories and their properties produced the tentative hypotheses. The main outcome of the data analysis is the list of stated tentative hypotheses.

The categories and their properties emerged from the data collection and analysis. They provide an organizational scheme that describes and explains the study participants' experience. The two categories and their properties can also be thought of as the variables that were generated through the research project. The properties are less abstract variables than the categories. The interrelationships of these variables describe and explain the participants' experiences. The processes that occur within each of these variable concepts can be influenced by the study abroad program and/or the participants themselves. For example, one of the variables was Initial Interactions. The way that the exchange

students handle these initial interactions can contribute to, or hinder, effective interpersonal relationship development.

Data analysis was begun during the data collection phase. After the data collection was finished there was a more comprehensive and exhaustive analysis of the data.

In this case the construction of hypotheses is not for the purpose of testing in order to find proofs, but to organize the data in a way that increases understanding of the social interaction between the students. For this reason I refer to them as "tentative hypotheses." The statement of tentative hypotheses resulted from the identification and interpretation of interrelationships between categories and properties.

Data Analysis Techniques

During the data analysis stage I employed several techniques which improved the validity and reliability of my analysis and interpretation:

1. I regularly talked to Mr. Seiya, my collaborator, to gain another perspective on the procedures for data collection. His role was especially important for checking my interpretations and observations regarding the Japanese students involved in the study. In addition to discussions, he gave valuable written feedback and recommended relevant reading materials.

The discussions with my interpreters were also valuable in checking interpretations.

2. I discussed with the participants my interpretation of the data which I collected. This added their perspective to the analysis and also allowed them to process the experience they were undergoing. In the interview transcripts from the second interview round, this checking of their perceptions of the interpretation is evident. The interview questions for the second round were guided by the patterns and themes which emerged from analyzing the data collected in the first round of interviews and observation.

In addition to the frequent checking of participant perceptions of my interpretations, I did a systematic member check (Guba and Lincoln, 1981) to get their reactions to my interpretations (see Appendix B). The paper was distributed to the exchange students. It was the basis for the second round of interviews. During this second round of interviews I referred to the paper when referring to my interpretations. This member check exercise had mixed reactions from the participants.

It was written in the form of a short play in which the characters were caricatures of exchange students. None of the real exchange students were portrayed, but rather the characters were composites of the exchange students. I thought this would be a way to bring the data to life.

The criticism from participants was that it sounded very negative, though they were generally in agreement that it was an accurate representation. The other problem was that it was too oblique for some participants and that they did not really extrapolate the research interpretations from the story. Overall, I think it worked well in accomplishing its purpose, but I would change the form next time to something more straightforward.

3. I kept a "methodology journal" as a part of the study. This kept me aware of methodological issues that were arising and allowed me to better make adjustments.

Qualitative data analysis consists of different techniques, according to different writers (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988). Glazer and Strauss' (1967) seminal work on grounded theory articulated a basis for qualitative data analysis. Strauss (1987) identified a couple of methodological guidelines which I incorporated in my study. These guidelines were: (1) making constant comparisons, and (2) using a coding paradigm. The following is a brief description of the comparative analysis procedure which I employed. It most resembles Glazer and Strauss' constant comparative analysis. This was a cyclical process, analyzing field data as it was collected and then making generalizations and hypotheses and then testing the hypotheses during the course of subsequent data collection and analysis:

1. I thoroughly read the field data, obtained through observation and interview transcripts, jotting down notes in the margins. I recorded ideas for very tentative category labels.
2. Using the thick descriptions depicted in the notes I made a primitive outline, showing regularities in the data.
3. The regularities and patterns were then transformed into categories and their properties. A category is an abstract concept. Each category then consists of several properties. Properties are less abstract concepts which describe a category.

This is how the coding paradigm was created. From the data, I recorded "units" of data on individual index cards. This was data deemed significant enough to record as part of the whole. Units of data were specific pieces of information. One unit of data was recorded onto each index card. As numbers of index cards began to accumulate, I then started to divide them into piles. Each pile consisted of look alike/feel alike units. Each pile contained cards that seemed to hang together, where they seemed to be about the same kind of process. Then each pile basically became a category, which I named.

Initially, the identification and labeling of these categories was driven by the concepts which framed the study. These included, among others, exchange relationships, perceptions of national status, value

differences, and reference groups. Other categories emerged intuitively.

From the very beginning of this comparison process, I also wrote interpretation memos. These were ideas of how the various categories and properties were interrelated. These memos were the first step in attempting to derive some holistic meaning from the categories and properties.

4. Subsequent units of data, as they were collected, were then added onto index cards, and sorted according to categories. If a unit of data did not fit into one of the categories, then a new category was created, or the unit was not used. This is a part of constant comparison.
5. In addition to the coding of data, by category, the interrelationship of properties within categories and/or between categories produced new concepts. This involved looking for recurring themes. The interrelationships between categories and/or properties within categories became my interpretations, or hypotheses.
6. Hypotheses were then written down and kept in mind in future analysis. The hypotheses should explain all known cases of a phenomenon. If hypotheses do explain all known cases, then a conclusion can be arrived at and demonstrated.

This was an on-going process and the categories and their properties changed all the time. The change was

based upon presenting interpretations to the participants and the subsequent data collection which resulted from that. In the final analysis (no pun intended), the final categories and properties were produced and this is what appears in chapter four. Admittedly, this whole process was quite intuitive. The final categories and properties were derived from thinking about how it could best be reported and also from which categories and properties could be interrelated to each other for a holistic explanation.

The intertwining of hypotheses could result in the development and extension of theory. In this study, I don't feel that happened. However, the generation of tentative hypotheses and their demonstration in the data should lead to tentative conclusions that will illuminate readers' understanding.

Quality and Credibility

Introduction

To what extent can one trust this qualitative case study's findings? That is the question which any research study must answer.

Patton (1990) discussed the issue in terms of quality and credibility. The credibility of the study depends upon three inquiry elements: (1) rigorous techniques and methods for gathering high-quality data that is carefully

analyzed, with attention to issues of validity, reliability, and triangulation; (2) the credibility of the researcher, which is dependent on training, experience, track record, status, and presentation of self; (3) philosophical belief in the phenomenological paradigm, that is, a fundamental appreciation of naturalistic inquiry, qualitative methods, inductive analysis, and holistic thinking.

Phenomenological Paradigm

Beginning with number three, this study was accomplished within the parameters of the phenomenological paradigm. The overall purpose of the study was to increase understanding, not to find universal truths. The concepts which were inductively formulated from the data were meant to illuminate and assist in explaining the experience of the study participants. The study was oriented toward practical application. The audience of the study will use the concepts and generated tentative hypotheses to better understand their own experience, and hence to improve it.

Researcher Credibility

Regarding the credibility of the researcher, I developed credibility during the course of data collection in Japan, and it is my hope that my credibility emerges through the writing of this dissertation.

My previous experience in Japan, and my understanding of Japanese culture, helped me make a successful entry with both visiting North American exchange students and my hosts in Japan. The process of the study was completely transparent. I maintained regular communication with the participants about the process of the study, as well as its content. Awareness of my own cultural bias has been made explicit in this paper. My collaboration with Mr. Seiya was a strategy to overcome my cultural bias and make myself more credible as the research instrument.

Triangulation

Data collection and analysis methods contributed to the validity and reliability of this study. As mentioned before, with the researcher as the primary research instrument, there is the element of intrinsic bias. One way I overcame this as an obstacle was to make explicit my cultural bias. A methodological approach to overcoming intrinsic bias is the utilization of triangulation. Patton (1990) identified four kinds of triangulation which contribute to verification of validation: (1) methods triangulation, that is, checking out the consistency of findings by utilizing different data collection methods; (2) triangulation of sources, that is, checking out the consistency of different sources using the same method; (3) analyst triangulation, using multiple analysts to review the findings; and (4) theory/perspective triangulation,

using multiple theories or perspectives to interpret the data.

Admittedly, this study is weak in methods triangulation. In the original design, participant observation was to complement the in-depth interviews. However, I was not able to implement this as an effective data collection method. The study's purpose and resultant questions did not require the use of quantitative methods.

Triangulation of sources occurred because of the reciprocal nature of the study. Since the study's participants consisted of both visiting exchange students and their Japanese hosts, these two groups of informants provided a comparison of perspectives from the standpoint of two different cultures. Additionally, the numbers of individuals who were interviewed within both groups provided multiple perspectives.

Analyst triangulation was employed to some extent. During the initial data analysis stages, after the first interview round, Mr. Seiya acted as an analyst. I presented my interpretations to him and he then followed with his own interpretations. This was particularly effective in ensuring appropriate cross-cultural interpretations. The participants themselves were involved in reviewing the findings and interpretations. The member check conducted before the second round of interviews was a systematic intervention. The participants reacted to the interpretations presented in the member check exercise. An

integral component to the second round of interviews was my frequent presentation of interpretations of the data collected in the initial interview round. The participants could then react to these interpretations with their own perspectives. The participants also were sent copies of the analysis chapter of this paper for review and comments.

Theory triangulation was utilized during the data analysis stage. The theories and concepts identified in the literature review provided a lens through which I could look to begin my interpretations. As data collection continued, some of the concepts were found to be more useful than others.

Perspective triangulation was accomplished by the longitudinal design of the study. Interviewing the participants at two very different points in their experience enabled both them and myself to contrast perspective changes due to time, experience, and development.

Reliability and Validity

In addition to triangulation, reliability and validity are the other two issues Patton identified as important when discussing methods and techniques that ensure credibility.

In order to address the issue of reliability, the question of whether or not the results make sense must be resolved.

In this chapter, I have already outlined the procedures for data collection and analysis. If these make sense to the reader, it contributes to the reliability of the results. The introductory and literature review chapters provide a detailed framework for the assumptions and theory which underlie the study. This also contributes to the reliability of the study.

The most important criteria for the study's reliability is its ability to increase understanding of the reader through its explanatory power. The methodology involved in data collection and analysis, as well as the theoretical underpinnings, can be independently verified for their reliability. An equally important indicator is the degree to which the study's audience is persuaded by the study.

This key indicator of the study's value to its audience also relates to the validity of the study. The following section addresses both internal and external validity.

Internal validity relates to how well the study represents the reality of the situation that was investigated. It is not a purpose of the study to represent an objective reality, a reality which allows one to find universal truths or variables of cause and effect.

Rather, the reality of the study is defined as the construction and interpretation of the participants' multiple perspectives by the researcher. In order for the reader to trust that the presentation by the researcher was valid, the researcher can undertake a number of actions. In the case of this study, I employed six strategies identified by Merriam (1988, p. 169) which support the claim of internal validity:

1. Triangulation-This was previously discussed.
2. Member checks-This was previously discussed. Member checks were accomplished through a formal written instrument at the study's mid-point, through presentation of the findings at the completion of data collection, as well as incorporated into the second round of interview questions.
3. Long-term observation at the research site-a key part of this study was its longitudinal nature, which included gathering data over a one-year period.
4. Peer examination-asking colleagues to comment on the findings as they emerge.

My collaborator, Mr. Seiya, was the key person in this process.

5. Participatory modes of research-involving participants in all phases of research. This was accomplished only to some extent. The participants were actively involved in the data analysis phase of research, but not in the design stages.

6. Researcher's biases-this was accomplished by my explication of my world-view and theoretical assumptions throughout this dissertation.

As mentioned earlier, in addition to these methodological and procedural strategies for ensuring internal validity, the practical application potential for the reader is a key indicator of validity. Patton (1990, p. 485) refers to this potential as "pragmatic validation" and goes on to say that it means " that the perspective presented is judged by its relevance to and use by those to whom it is presented: their perspective and actions joined to the evaluator's perspective and actions." So, if readers find this case relevant to their own use, it contributes to the validity of the study.

This leads to a discussion of external validity. Are this study's findings generalizable to other cases in the same area of investigation? Could the same things be said, for example, of social interaction and interpersonal relationship development for Italian students studying at an Australian university?

The findings for the case of the Kwansei Gakuin Program can be generalized to other study abroad programs in Japan. The substance of the study's generated tentative hypotheses is specific to the Japan study abroad context. It is specific to interpersonal relationship development within the Japanese university context. For example, the variable of *honne/tatemae* and the hypothesis that North

American students will establish better relationships if they can communicate this way, is culturally specific to Japan.

However, the variables and their relationships within which the tentative hypotheses were produced can be thought of as cultural general and could be related to study abroad student interpersonal relationship development in any cultural context. For example, the two main variables of hierarchy and friendship are of course relevant in any culture. If one were sensitized to and looking out for the nature of hierarchy and friendship, one could more quickly learn how these are carried out in a specific cross-cultural situation.

Value-orientation theory (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) and other writers dealing with cultural values (Stewart, 1972; and Hall, 1976) were helpful in explaining cultural differences for this case. This theoretical perspective can be useful in any cross-cultural context, whether it is study abroad or other social interaction situations. Utilizing the value-orientations identified in chapter four, one could observe and analyze how any two specific cultures' people interact within these dimensions. This is an example of the transcultural variables that Goldsen, Suchman, & Williams (1956) claimed were necessary for study abroad research.

The small sample size of a case study often leads to questions of generalizability across different populations.

If predictive value and/or search for proofs were the goal, then this would be a problem. The purpose of this study is to increase understanding on the part of study abroad administrators and students. In this sense, the generalizability, or external validity of the study, is looked at differently than in more traditional quantitative studies, with larger sample populations.

Locke (1989, p. 12) articulated this well:

> Confirmation of validity in other contexts is a function of the reader, not the methodology. Given thick contextual descriptions and vivid portrayals of participants, most readers have little difficulty recognizing situations that are parallel to their own, or detecting assertions that make no sense in their own experience. Considering the limitations of sampling in conventional science, it may be that strong recognition of transferability by the reader is in no way an inferior measure of external validity.

Chapter four consists of the thick contextual and process description mentioned above. The portrayal of the study participants also contributes to the validity of the study and the reader's ability to relate these participants' experiences to participants in their own programs.

Summary

The research questions and resultant approach to the study emerged from the underlying conceptual framework. This framework is based upon past study abroad and relevant social science research. This conceptual framework and the purpose of the study predicated a qualitative case study

approach. The foundational assumptions behind this approach were described.

The research site and sample were examined. This included a description of the physical site and the exchange program. The participant sample was described. Contexts and situations in which exchange students interacted with hosts were described.

The methods of data gathering utilized in the study were direct observation and in-depth interviewing. Sample interview questions were included in this chapter. The data analysis rationale, techniques and procedures were described.

Finally, an analysis of the quality and credibility of the study was accomplished.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter, which analyzes, synthesizes and interprets the data, is an attempt to make some meaning of all this data. The purpose is first of all to bring out the students' perceptions regarding interpersonal relationship development, both Japanese and North American. As mentioned in the previous chapter, as the primary research instrument, I was the one who synthesized all the data and the interpretation was solely mine. The outcome of the data analysis and interpretation consisted of tentative hypotheses which explain the experience of the study participants.

The data collection was described in the previous chapter, along with a description of the initial analysis stages, which were done in conjunction with further data collection.

The purpose of the data analysis is to present some tentative hypotheses which are explanatory and illuminative, to make these tentative hypotheses based upon a "preponderance of the data" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). These tentative hypotheses are formulated inductively from the data that was generated.

Utilizing the constant comparative method to generate categories and their properties, I came up with two broad

categories with their respective properties. Properties are the elements which make up a category. The categories contain descriptive and explanatory properties.

The categories were kept at a high level of abstraction in order to increase their explanatory efficacy. Glazer and Strauss (1967, p. 110) identified several reasons for formulating a small set of high level concepts, in order to increase explanatory power. First, the parsimony achieved with a few broad categories and their interrelationships provides clearer explanation. Secondly, when a few high level concepts are used, the tentative hypotheses which their interrelationships produce create a wide scope of applicability for numerous situations. This study's audience will determine how useful the explanation provided is for their particular situation and context. Broadening the categories and their resultant tentative hypotheses increases the possibilities that the reader will be able to relate the findings to their own particular situation.

In order to maintain a high level of abstraction, categories and properties were limited to ones that were interrelated with each other. The result of this was a holistic, integrated body of description and explanation.

Even though one of the basic assumptions of this study is that the study participant group must include both Japanese and North Americans, one of the limitations of the study is that most of the properties, and hence categories,

were initiated by the North American students and then analyzed and interpreted by me, albeit with some help from Mr. Seiya. There are two basic reasons for this. Since I am American, the research questions were originally formulated with an American bias. This is also because the research reviewed prior to the study was primarily from a Western perspective.

Once the categories and properties were formulated, they were synthesized and their interrelationships examined. In order to maintain a high level of abstraction and thus keep the explanatory power strong, the goal was to utilize categories and their properties that were all able to be related to each other in some way. This results in a holistic explanation.

The two broad categories that emerged from the data collection and analysis process were hierarchy and friendship. Chapter three described the interaction contexts from which the data emerged- host families, clubs and circles, in classes, on campus outside class, travel, social activities such as festivals, meals together, dancing, parties etc. The following are the categories' respective properties. Properties are concepts which explain the categories, especially when their interrelationships are examined:

1. Hierarchy properties- guest (*okyakusan*) syndrome, gender, alcohol's function in hierarchy, student identity and higher education perceptions,

honne/tatemae (inside face/outside face), and strategies for dealing with hierarchy.

2. Friendship properties - initial interactions, time orientation, definition of friendship, and hanging out vs. structure.

A word on language. If you look at the above categories, you might be inclined to wonder how language differences did not come to be included as a property or category unto itself. Language differences of course played a huge role in the way interpersonal relationships were or were not developed. It is assumed that it was a fundamental aspect of every interaction and every relationship. It was so pervasive that it was a part of every property. In the analysis and interpretation, language is addressed when it has a direct relation to the category or property being described. Language differences were a fundamental obstacle to developing in-depth interpersonal relationships. This may be common sensical and that is why this study did not focus on language differences as a separate phenomenon.

Brief Description of Overall Relationship Development

During the second round of interviews I asked the exchange students to characterize the state of their interpersonal relationships with Japanese people. Alan said he could characterize it in one word- "shallow." Sean remarked, "Try [to develop deep friendships] but don't

expect really to make these long lasting friendships that assimilate you into, you hit it off so well and you know march off into the sunset together as cross-cultural best friends, because it won't happen."

These two comments are overall representative of the feelings of the exchange student group. Overall, the exchange students who participated in the study had a very satisfactory year studying abroad at Kwansei Gakuin University. They all were very glad they had come for their year to study abroad at Kwansei Gakuin and did not regret their decision at all. The design of the Kwansei Gakuin exchange program enabled them to have a great variety of experiences. Their relationships with Japanese students, faculty and staff, host families, and the general public were cordial and enjoyable. The exchange students interacted with their hosts extensively, developed their Japanese language skills, learned a lot about Japanese culture, grew personally, and left with some friends.

However, the exchange students were largely disappointed with the relationships they developed with Japanese people in terms of depth. They did not establish close and deep interpersonal relationships with Japanese people. The exchange students generally established relatively closer relationships with Japanese people who had been abroad or had some Western experience - Japanese people who could adapt to the exchange students' cultural behaviors and also who had good English ability.

In the time frame of one year at Kwansei Gakuin, the beginning two or three months were quite good for the exchange students. Japanese people were hospitable and kind and generous. This made the initial adjustment to Japan generally successful. The students were treated as guests and this worked out quite well during the first few months. However, as the year wore on, the students found themselves still being treated as guests, when they wanted to be treated less as guests and more like they were fitting in. Because of cultural differences, which s examined in this chapter, the exchange students generally did not emerge from the guest role and establish deep relationships with Japanese people.

In the following section of analysis and interpretation it will be seen that their one year of experience was basically a process of them trying to fit into the Japanese societal structure somewhere and Japanese people also trying to fit them in somewhere.

This thesis' main recommendation will be that exchange students participate in a rigorous pre-departure cultural orientation program before participating in Japanese exchange programs in order to "jump start" the process of establishing interpersonal relationships. A one year time frame is short for relationship development in Japanese culture. If the exchange students had better understood some of the basics of Japanese cultural values and customs, they could have more effectively started relationship

development and perhaps have achieved more depth during their one-year stay.

Main Findings - Hierarchy Category

As may be expected, a large part of the North American student experience was trying to fit in somewhere (one common metaphor for the North Americans' view of their situation is that of an alien dropped down from another planet). Japanese people tried to place the North Americans somewhere in their existing hierarchy, as well as to determine how their own place in the societal hierarchy was affected by their relationships with the North American students. While every society, including North American, functions according to a socially stratified structure, the stratifications in Japanese society are quite explicit in their vertical hierarchical form. Hierarchy in Japan consists of a system with people ranked one above another. Ranking criteria are generally described. Rank is based upon age, job position, gender, company, or university affiliation, and other pre-determined criteria. This was something new for North American students who hail from a more relatively egalitarian stratification.

Guest (*Okyakusan*) Syndrome Property

One of the properties of this hierarchy category is the guest (*okyakusan*) syndrome. One of the struggles for North American students was that of sometimes desperately

wanting to fit in, or just be treated like a familiar person. However, even after an extended period of time, they often felt like they were treated very much like a guest. As Jane said after nine months in Japan:

> Well, I still feel very much like a guest with my host family. I'm really ready to go home for that reason. I'm just tired of not really knowing what's going on, and not knowing if I'm intruding or not . . . I like the host mother and father a lot . . . but I'm still very much a guest and it's been nine months. I long to go home and rummage through my refrigerator, you know what I mean?

Jane's assumption in the beginning was that she would be living in a place that would be her home in Japan. When I interviewed the host mother after Jane had left Japan, she indeed said that she considered Jane as a guest in her house. She in fact said that she considered her home similar to a *geshuku*, a kind of Japanese inn. While this was not consistent across all host families, the point here is illuminating. After nine months, the host family and Jane had differing assumptions about the basic foundation for their relationship.

Many of the North American students expressed that they felt like guests throughout their stay. Excellent Japanese hospitality was a common theme in my early conversations with North American students. It then did not seem to progress to a more familiar feel in many cases. Indeed, central to their entire experience with establishing interpersonal relations was this wanting to just fit in, but then finding it difficult to be treated

with what they considered familiarity. Margaret spoke of how this guest treatment and hospitality was great for the first few months. However, in her second interview in June, she expressed frustration with still being treated like a guest, like someone new in the country. "I hate it. Oh God." She then went on to explain how this was largely the reason she was ready to leave.

Within the Japanese hierarchical structure, where foreigners do not have an assigned place, making them guests seems to be a tangible level in which Japanese hosts have some guidance on how to treat foreigners. The continual treatment of being treated like a guest, keeping one outside the inner Japanese hierarchy, was a barrier to the North American students joining the hierarchy and finding some status other than as guests, and hence was a barrier to the kind of relationship development that they wanted.

Something else that emerged from Jane's quote was the feeling that she may be intruding. This intruding feeling may have been a result of adopting a polite affect, just as Japanese people do. Often when people walk into a house they will express how they hope they are not intruding, literally "I am being an obstacle." This feeling of intrusion may also be fostered by being treated like a guest. Many of the North American students expressed this same kind of feeling in contexts besides the host family, such as clubs and parties.

The guest syndrome occurred in the contexts of the host family stay and the club situation. In the case of the host family, many North American students expressed frustration that they were continually treated as guests, even after they had been there for a while. There were a number of problems between host families and North American students, especially among male students. There were several mid-semester changes of host families during the year. Several host families planned from the beginning to host students for one semester only. Therefore, almost all of the students had more than one host family during their one-year stay. When discussing this situation of host families treating North American students like guests, one Japanese student, Hiroshi, replied that North American students will often have more than one host family because Japanese families can't handle guests for one full year at a time. Use of the word "guest" here is significant.

In the experience of the North American students, they found that the very beginning of the stay was positive because of this guest treatment and hospitality. It meant there were no major pressures on them and they had a fairly good transition into Japan. However, as time went on, they came to see this guest treatment as a major obstacle in their motivation for trying to establish relationships. They all came to understand the guest dynamic and, as a group, it generally caused them to cease trying to establish close relationships. They became more resigned

to the fact that they would not establish close relationships. Some felt frustrated, as we saw previously with Margaret, and some took it more in stride and accepted it.

According to Nami, who studied in the United States as an exchange student, she felt this difference on the other end, when she was in the States. She said it was difficult for her in the beginning of her stay because the people in the States did not treat her special or differently at all. She realized that just by looking at her, there was no way that Americans would know she was a foreigner. She did not experience people extending hospitality to her even when they knew she was a foreign student. People just treated her more naturally, not like a guest.

In Japan, people extended more because of this perception of exchange students as guests. While this was seen as positive in the beginning of the stay, it was later perceived as negative and a barrier to relationship development. Nami remarked "It must be hard for foreign students [in Japan], because they want to be like regular, but we do *okyakusan* [guest]."

The progression in understanding and accepting the other culture is highlighted in the case of Sean, whose father visited him in Japan after he had been there for about nine months. This guest syndrome came up one night when Sean, his host family, and Sean's father all went out for dinner. In the beginning of his stay in Japan, Sean

struggled with Japanese people paying for meals when they invited him out. He was not comfortable with the other person always picking up the tab. He learned that people generally do not "go dutch" in Japan and that the person who invites is the one who is expected to pay. As Sean related the evening out with his host family and father, he remarked "it was a great learning experience for me because it just told me how much things have changed since last September."

Sean's father wanted to pay for the meal afterwards, but the Japanese host family insisted upon paying. Sean related:

> I didn't feel any kind of guilt in host parents paying for it but my father wanted to pay for it, and there was a little fight. I took my father away and I said you're a guest here. He said what do you mean I'm a guest here? You're a guest [Sean is a guest] here and I came here to visit you and I want to take your host family out because they are taking care of you. What are you talking about? And I thought, yea what am I talking about [laughter]? And then I said, but Dad, you're in Japan. And I thought, hey now what did I say, where does this logic come from? But then I realized that's Japanese logic.

Sean then went on to relate to me how he realizes now that if Japanese people come to visit him in North America, the situation will be reversed and that he would never allow them to pay for anything there and that would be the expectation from both sides. "I think that's the Japanese custom and I've come to realize that."

Sean was beginning to see that the time frame is different for Japanese relationships. They are thought of

in the long-term. The guest situation in Japan may result in him "paying back" Japanese people if and when they visit in North America. Sean's Father wanted to reciprocate with the host family while he was in Japan. The better strategy for sincere reciprocation may be to strongly invite the host family to North America, where they can be treated as a guest. So, Sean was increasing his ability to establish interpersonal relationships by seeing that he could reciprocate by treating his host family like a guest if they ever visit North America.

As with all cultures, the host family and other Japanese people are just doing what is natural for them in the Japanese cultural context. They did not treat the North American students like guests in order to make them frustrated and limit their ability to establish the kind of interpersonal relationships they wanted. On the contrary, they were treating them with hospitality and kindness. The North American students were there for a relatively very short time and the place they belong in the hierarchy is as guests. If Japanese people visited North America, they would expect to be treated as guests also.

In contrast to Jane's host family, other host families often said that after a time they considered the North American student to "be like one of the family." One of the host mothers who strongly maintained this had not invited the North American student into one whole floor of the house, where other members of the family were free to

go. Other host families expressed that students were just like their sons or daughters, but then treated them as guests.

Part of the perception on the part of the North American students may be what constitutes being treated like one of the family. Jane had mentioned that she longed to look through her refrigerator at home. Her assumption was that if you are being treated as one of the family, you will help yourself to things like getting food out of the refrigerator. However, one likely scenario in Japan would be that the husband and children do not often do this either, but that they ask the mother to do these things for them. This may relate to cleaning and washing clothes also.

While some of the North American students complained of being treated like guests, sometimes these same students were complained about by their host families for not doing enough around the house, like cleaning their rooms and doing laundry.

Whatever the case, the perception on the part of the North American students was that they were treated as guests quite often. As mentioned before, host families often expressed that they considered guest students as one of the family, or like a son or daughter. It was difficult to distinguish as to whether or not this was a form of *tatemae*.

Honne/Tatemae Property

This brings into play another property of hierarchy - *honne/tatemae*, or translated, "inside face/outside face." I will use the Japanese words throughout this discussion, as the English translation feels awkward. The direct translation just does not seem to do justice. *Honne* and *tatemae* are basically two opposing modes of interaction. *Honne* and *tatemae* are concepts which underlie everyday interactions. Basically, when you interact using *honne*, you speak and act according to how you really feel and according to what you really think. When you interact in a *tatemae* mode you act and speak according to how the other person feels or according to what the other person is thinking. You are trying to fulfill the other's expectations and the overall priority in the interaction is to maintain harmony. These modes of interaction are explicit. All Japanese people understand them and when someone speaks in a *tatemae* mode, usually the person speaking knows that the receiver knows it is a *tatemae* mode of speaking. This of course affects perceptions immensely. If the receiver in an interaction does not understand the dynamics of *honne/tatemae*, then the message may be misunderstood by the receiver. If the sender was interacting in a *tatemae* mode, but the receiver did not understand this, then the perception of the receiver may not be what the sender intended. This was the case of the North American students until they later understood this

mode of interaction. Most, but not all, of the students came to understand this. The ones who did understand it generally had more positive interactions with Japanese people.

When I explained to Tamiko, my interpreter, that some host families were saying that the exchange students are like a member of the family, but the students still feel like guests, she explained that this was *honne/tatemae*. This was the host family talking in the *tatemae* mode. Especially in the beginning of the stay, the perceptions created because of not understanding *honne/tatemae* presented problems for the North American students. After two months Bruce remarked on his and Alan's joining of a club:

> When they see me and Alan, we were in the club, they welcomed us, but at first I didn't think so . . . The main thing is that Japanese people speak very indirectly, so we don't know if they mean it or not . . . That's a problem between Japanese and foreign people when they meet.

A concrete example is the curfew that was placed upon the North American students during their homestays. Both female and male students had curfews during their homestays. The time limit varied. Sometimes it was as early as nine o'clock. The latest was the "last train" curfew. Since all of the students who were not within walking distance of their host family houses used the trains, the host family wanted them to come home with the last train, rather than stay out all night and come home on the first morning train. For North American students who

were used to their independence during university life in the States, this was a difficult adjustment. This treatment was of course similar to how a Japanese family would treat their own children, especially female children.

I was with North American students on several occasions in the evening during their first couple of months. This was a big problem for them. They often complained and fretted over having to go home so early, especially when they were just beginning to have a good time. But since this was a rule, they figured it had to be followed. When they had rules in their houses in North America, they were created to be followed. Otherwise, there would be no reason to have the rules. This problem with the curfew contributed to some problems with the host families. This was one factor involved with students and host families who sometimes had conflict. This conflict most often occurred when a student would not be home by the curfew time, but did not call to inform the family of this.

After a few months, I noticed that North American students were not always going home before their curfew hour, but were calling their host parents and letting them know they would not be home then, and would tell them a later time. This was generally all right with the host parents. So this eventually ceased to be a big problem once the students learned they could call and stay out later.

I attended a host family orientation toward the end of the school year. Attending were the families who would host students in the coming year. Sean and Allen attended as resources. Sean and Allen both remarked on how the curfew was a difficulty for North American students. One of the host fathers remarked, well the curfew is just *tatemae*. This remark caused lightbulbs to go off in my head and also I think for Alan and Sean. The curfew served the purpose of preserving outside appearances, and was a way for the host family to realize their responsibility as host parents. But in the reality of the situation, they just wanted to be informed if the students were coming back late. The perception of the North Americans was this is a rule that should be followed and the perceptions of the host families was that this was an appearance rule that guided behavior but was not to be taken literally.

One phenomenon which occurred when the North American students first arrived was the general invitations they would receive from Japanese students. The Japanese students would invite a North American student out to do something, but not in a specific way. They would often exchange phone numbers but then not receive phone calls from the Japanese students. This was vexing at first for the North American students. Hiroshi posited that this exchange of phone numbers was a kind of *tatemae*. It was the way to say "I am interested in you." So the exchange itself was symbolic of interest in a relationship, even if

they perhaps had no intention of following up. This is examined in more depth in the friendship category section.

Another form of *tatemae* that I discovered again relates back to the guest syndrome. Japanese people sometimes expressed to North American students that they did not need to adapt and change according to Japanese customs and values because they are foreigners. First of all, this reinforced the North American students' status as guests and it is questionable whether or not this was what the Japanese people really felt. It may have been more of a gesture for maintaining harmony - *tatemae*. Instead of saying that they were offended or felt that the student should adapt more, they would sometimes communicate that it was all right because the student was a foreigner. Some Japanese students remarked that it was incumbent upon North American students to change. Some of the North American students did not feel a great need to change to Japanese customs and it may have been in part due to this *tatemae* communication that it was all right. Indeed, Japanese people rarely directly confronted exchange students on not adapting to Japanese customs, although they would sometimes do this through a third party. *Tatemae* communication then also implies that conflict will be communicated via a third party or other indirect means. After two months in Japan Sophia was becoming aware of this. "They don't have a criticizing mind. So I don't think they will say something negative. . . If they say something negative to you it's

going to be indirect." The overall purpose of *honne/tatemae* is to maintain harmony. Now the problem in establishing interpersonal relations is that a North American may not be aware that they are being insensitive or offensive in a situation. Sean spoke of his view on this notion that Japanese people will excuse you because you are a foreigner and therefore it is all right:

> Westerners who think they are not a member of society [Japanese], they never are a member of society, they never can be a member of society, they are right. But, those who take that assumption and then apply it to a set of circumstances like language, like behavior, stuff like that, are wrong in the extension, in that extension it takes it too far I think. Those Westerners who kid themselves into feeling that because they are an exception and they're not accepted into the group, that there are no expectations for them to, there may not be an expectation for them to fulfill all of the behaviors of the group, you know obligations of the group, but if they do it, it works a heck of a lot better. If they are able or showing a notion to try these things, to learn about it, I've heard like comments coming out of, I could fill reams of paper with the comments I've made to Japanese people. I mean they've sort of suggested well if you can't do it, that's OK. And I've said hang on a second, if I'm a member of this group, I mean for instance *keigo* [honorific language], it's a big thing, and many Westerners don't know *keigo*, don't know how to use it. And I've talked to Japanese people who have said, you know in a three or four person situation, one of them will say well Sean why are you studying *keigo*? And I'll say because I think it's really important. If I'm speaking Japanese I should speak Japanese properly . . . And another student will come off and say that's right, yea that's really correct. And this is the bad thing about Japan is that we have this notion that Westerners are different so they can't understand, so we forgive them for that fatal flaw and Westerners believe that, but the point they miss is that forgiving them for not being able to do this puts them outside, way outside . . . And I personally believe that a lot of

> Westerners take the easy way out and they believe the Japanese when the Japanese say you don't have to do it. And the Japanese are very kind in saying you don't have to do it. And they're not doing it with any sort of ulterior motive, I don't think. And therefore the situation, the Westerners are believing something that the Japanese are being very polite in saying. And in doing so, the situation deteriorates Ithink.

Sean identifies this excusing on the part of Japanese people as being polite. Politeness is a facet of *tatemae*, keeping harmony. Jill was beginning to recognize this early on. After one month she remarked "I heard that they [Japanese people] want to give you the best information possible and they don't want to let you down so they'd rather not tell you what they think." However, Sean identified that ultimately this situation contributes to deterioration. The end result of forgiving foreigners, and I would say that the use of *tatemae* is a key component of this forgiveness, is that it puts foreign students "outside, way outside." Being on the outside of course limits your ability to develop satisfying interpersonal relationships. So, while *tatemae* can serve to provide some comfort for North American students when they are not called upon to adapt more, it again presents a barrier to them having a meaningful status in the hierarchy.

Honne/tatemae is of course not a problem for Japanese people. It is just part of their culture. As I wrote earlier, the sender of a message in the *tatemae* mode usually knows that the receiver of the message knows it is a *tatemae* mode message. As Sean said:

> When the Japanese say yes and it really means no, the other Japanese person knows that they mean no. They're being honest but they're not really saying I don't like you, but if you understand that it's you know, that's just *honne* and *tatemae*, when someone is speaking *tatemae* to you they are not being dishonest with you, if you could understand that.

Sometimes foreigners are likely to associate *tatemae* with dishonesty and this can turn them off from adapting to this mode of communication. Even when they do adapt, there can be a negative judgment when doing so. When I asked Neshek in his second interview to identify some of the obstacles to establishing interpersonal relationships, he went into a description of a mode of interacting that I would characterize as *tatemae*. He started out talking about how not knowing the expectations of others was a barrier, but then went on to describe a strategy for dealing with this:

> If you're a bootlicker it usually comes out OK. [a bootlicker? I queried] It's somebody who's sort of like yea OK thank you very much and . . . ah be real apologetic about anything you might have done to offend somebody. Andat the same time you know you say you're sorry and I really like you as a person. If you're always, if you're always like very nice and happy and kind then you will have no trouble with Japanese culture. [I ask if he found himself adapting to that] yea yea in general I think so. Because you know it's fine, whenever I start speaking Japanese you know my mind just goes "ching!" It turns into an entirely different thing it's like you know I'm always saying like oh really oh! Sophia says my voice goes up two notches whenever I start speaking Japanese [in pitch] . . . It's affirming and always giving the reaction that they want, or at least what you think they want. . . you know you have this real, it's a very positive feeling kind of thing. It's kind of disgusting because it's mostly a veneer.

While Neshek adapted to this "veneer", he judged it negatively. Here was a case of changing in order to establish better relationships even though the change didn't seem to fit him. The *tatemae* mode of communication is one way to make yourself part of a group, and to help find your status in the group. When you are together with a group in Japan, you cover your own feelings and beliefs if it is going to detract from harmony in the group. One of the reasons North American students can perceive it negatively is because it seems like it isn't honest, it's a "veneer." This is not positive to most North Americans. Another aspect of *tatemae* is that if it contributes to the group harmony, this very often subdues individualistic behavior, which can provide difficulties for North Americans.

Jane found that she could not spend long periods of time with her Japanese friends, even if she liked them a lot. She talks of her need for individuality in terms of moods:

> I know that they will misunderstand my moods, I can't explain them you know in English. You know in English you can say it with the right tone, where they know you're not mad at them, you're not bored, that you just want to be quiet for a while. But I can't do that in Japanese, so that makes it very uncomfortable and I feel bad because I think they are worried about me.

Jane found it hard to hide her real feelings (*honne*) and to maintain harmony in the group by acting with *tatemae*. This reluctance to spend long amounts of time with Japanese students provided quite an obstacle in

establishing relationships, as length of time is a key aspect to any relationship building in Japan. This is examined more in the friendship section.

There was a positive perception of North American students who could adapt to this style of communication on the part of some Japanese students. Megumi remarked that her first advice to exchange students would be to keep harmony and look friendly.

One of the frustrations for North American students, especially in the beginning of their stay, was the lack of expression of opinions by Japanese people. Part of the ability to use *honne/tatemae* is one's inclination and willingness to not voice opinions in group situations. When I asked Megumi why Japanese people do not strongly voice opinions, she replied "I think Japanese people are good at using *honne/tatemae*." On my first day at Kwansei Gakuin, I encountered a North American woman from the previous program. We chatted a bit and the topic of her relationship with Japanese women came up and she said she did not have any Japanese women friends. A large reason for this was "they don't have any opinions."

The North American students had quite a high motivation for learning about Japan, Japanese culture, and Japanese people. Their accustomed way of learning about these types of things was to talk about them openly and candidly. The North American students ran into difficulty, as Alan relates, "to sit down and actually talk to someone

about something more serious than the weather it's difficult. . . or they want to talk about it at a very superficial level." Jane's strategy was to bring up seemingly neutral subjects in order to elicit views and opinions. "Like sometimes I'll bring out something like you know Cambodia or something like some kind of an issue you know and continually the reaction is just amazingly weak."

While the difference in expression of opinions caused a barrier in getting to know about Japan in general, it caused barriers for interpersonal relationship development in making friends as well. Jane:

> So I find that I don't know, at least in North America I find that the people that are my best friends are the people with whom I can have really important discussions. I can listen to whatever they have to say. They can listen to whatever I have to say. And the opinions fly back and forth... I don't think I could do that with the Japanese students.

Mary discussed the same topic and compared her talks with Jill, one of the other exchange students, to her talks with Japanese women:

> I think maybe the reluctance of girls especially to talk about certain topics. Like for example, I can talk with Jill about almost anything, you know, . . . where I don't think I'd be able to bring it up, you know like just the topic itself might be taboo with the Japanese girls. . . I'm afraid of, I tend to voice my opinions a lot. I'm afraid if I say something like . . . if I voice my opinion I might be afraid it will offend them because they don't think like that at all.

As was already mentioned, from a Japanese perception, the voicing of opinions is seen as something that does not

contribute to the cohesiveness of the group and can be seen to not be an effective use of *honne/tatemae*. When I was explaining to Mr. Seiya, my collaborator on this project, what I was learning about the differences in expression of opinions, he illustrated the view of strong opinions voiced by an individual on the part of other group members. He exclaimed, "he has a strong opinion?!" and then moved his body back in a movement of mock horror.

Megumi related how she interacts with her Japanese friends regarding opinions. I asked her about the relationship between opinions and *honne/tatemae*:

> If I express myself, if I express my own opinion, and that is different from my friend's opinion, maybe I would use *tatemae*, not my opinion but *tatemae*. I use *tatemae* for keeping harmony with my friends.

In addition, there is a perception on the part of Japanese people that direct expressions are unnecessary. Mr. Seiya wrote:

> Japanese friendship has such quality of depth. But the way of expressing it may be different from exchange students'. In Japanese culture, the direct expression of one's feeling is seen as superficial. So, to close and important friends, Japanese often avoid using direct expressions of their feelings or opinions.

It didn't take long for exchange students to see that it would be difficult to enter into what they considered meaningful conversations, and hence presented a barrier to their relationship development. In order to deal with this perceived limitation, three basic strategies emerged. One was that some of the students found themselves being

quieter and not feeling the need to express their opinions and be so vocal. Or they interacted more in a *tatemae* mode, as we saw earlier with Neshek. While this made them more satisfied on a personal developmental level, I had no data evidence that it contributed to better interaction. However, one could speculate that it would. Another strategy was that the exchange students spent most of their time together, creating a "pack mentality." This is discussed in more depth in the strategies section of this hierarchy category. The third basic strategy was that they gravitated toward Japanese students who had some experience with North America, having studied abroad there, or had extensive travel there. Jane remembered one person who she felt could talk about a deeper level of topics. This person had studied abroad and Jane expressed that he was not a typical Japanese. "But I remember when I met with him and talked with him the first time how surprised I was that we weren't small talking."

For Japanese people, maintaining harmony with the group took precedence over expressing opinions. For North American students, the expression of opinions was a way "to really get to know somebody." This provided problems for the North American students in that they felt they were having a hard time establishing in-depth relationships. For a North American, one way to establish an interaction with someone is to choose a subject which is not personal, but is more of a general issue or topic of conversation,

such as politics. The North American can then voice perspectives and opinions and listen to the other do the same thing. As Jane said, "the opinions fly back and forth." In the friendship section it is shown that Japanese topics of conversations, especially in the beginning of a relationship, are more personal, such as asking about boyfriends/girlfriends or family. When I suggested to a Japanese student that if she really wanted to get to establish a relationship with exchange students, she might say to a foreign student something about abortion, for example, and express her opinion and then ask the opinion of the foreign student. She replied "I think we don't like the *honne* question."

The ability to effectively use the modes of *honne/tatemae* is seen as a sign of maturity in Japan. Tamiko remarked, "You're grown-up when you can use *honne/tatemae*." Remembering that *tatemae* is used to maintain harmony within a group setting, and to basically respond in the way that receivers of communication will be pleased with, the ability to use *honne/tatemae* looks like the ability to be empathetic. During a discussion of *honne/tatemae* Nami said, "maturity is thinking about how the other person feels." The ability to be empathetic, to use *honne/tatemae*, will contribute to one's ability to become a member of the group, and to find one's status within the hierarchy of the group. Japanese interviewees

told of how when they were children they did not have to worry about *honne/tatemae*, but as adults they do.

As discussed earlier, one of the frustrations for North American students was that they had a hard time eliciting opinions of any kind from Japanese people. The exchange students were eager to learn about Japanese people. One of the ways North Americans learn about others is through hearing their opinions. After one month in Japan, Jane remarked "I'm interested in really finding out about the mind set of how people are and stuff. I just find that at a certain point they don't want to tell you what they are feeling, what they are thinking. They don't want to open themselves up." For Japanese people, this need for expression of individual opinions can be viewed as not being able to use *honne/tatemae*, and therefore immature. On the other hand, when North American people encounter someone who seemingly does not have an opinion, they may perceive this person as immature. This different perception of opinions caused a barrier in relationship development.

Hiroshi, who had studied abroad in North America, articulated the two different perceptions in his second interview. During a discussion of *honne/tatemae* and the expression of opinions, he said:

> Because I think foreigner express their feelings . . . But as you said Japanese have to first think what kind of atmosphere am I in [*tatemae*], so I have to like distinguish my language or is this proper behavior or language or we consider a lot. But American people speak and express their

> feelings. So when I hesitate they [Americans] think oh he doesn't have any opinions and he [American person] keeps talking and talking and talking so he has initiative in the conversation and I feel inferior or something and I try to express myself. Like when I was in the States, this is what I thought, if I keep quiet, each time even I keep quiet or I say mm [thinking sound], lots of Japanese think oh, Hiroshi is thinking. Sothey're going to wait. But in the States when I said mm, just they think oh he doesn't have any opinions because he doesn't say anything. So he doesn't have opinions so he's not grown up in like logically or in mentally so he's kid or something, so they treat me like a baby or younger.

Hiroshi expressed that he was treated like a child in the States when he was in a thoughtful mode, but that it would be considered mature in Japan and people would wait for him to speak. I then asked him if a Japanese person who takes initiative and has a lot of opinions is considered childlike in Japan and he replied, "yea or we think he's arrogant. But if a foreigner does that we think he's different so he has leadership or something."

North American students saw the lack of assertiveness and opinion sharing as a barrier in relationship development. However, I did not find evidence that the North Americans being vociferous with opinions or not using *tatemae* offended or made Japanese people feel negative toward the exchange students. Japanese people did not seem to dislike the more *honne* behavior of the exchange students, but Japanese people, in general, did not act the same way, as it was not within the cultural norms to do so. The people who had some experience in North America had

sometimes made this adaptation, but not the general population.

Instead of focusing negative feelings toward the visiting students when they did not appropriately use *honne/tatemae* or did not reserve their opinions, this behavior on the part of the North American students may have intimidated Japanese people, or made them nervous. While this is probably not the whole explanation, it appears that the way North American students were direct and voiced themselves lead to a feeling of intimidation, or perhaps inferiority on the part of the Japanese students. This was reflected in Hiroshi's previous comments. This was the reaction because the exchange students were different. They were foreigners. Japanese people acting the same way would be considered arrogant or immature, not as some kind of leaders.

The North American students did not at first perceive that they could be intimidating the Japanese people. They were too busy being intimidated themselves. However, I had been receiving this kind of feedback from Japanese people and when I fed this back to exchange students in their member check exercise, they were surprised by it. So even though they were not consciously, directly affected by this feeling on the part of some of the Japanese students, this probably still contributed to inhibiting relationship development and served the purpose of reinforcing the

exchange students' status as guests and being outside the hierarchy.

Some Japanese students expressed this feeling to be inferiority. Some expressed it as intimidation, or being scared to talk to the exchange students. There were several aspects to this feeling being generated. Kimiko covered several of these aspects when I asked her why it was sometimes hard to mingle with the exchange students as a group:

> First there is language barrier and second they are much taller than me so I think they might look down on me [I ask if this means only physically] . . . First they are bigger than me and since they are exchange students I think they are smarter than average students and also they can speak English and I can't.

The physical size of North Americans can itself be intimidating. Kimiko also brought up the perception that exchange students may be smarter than average students. Speaking English is also intimidating for Japanese people. They spend years studying English in school and then there is a status attached to those who can speak English well. I discussed this in chapter three.

There is a relation between this intimidation and *honne/tatemae*. When I asked Kenji about this issue of inferiority or intimidation, he described it more as "being scared to talk to them." Kenji went on:

> It's not only the size of the body I understand. It's more like you never, for example Japanese people who have never talked to foreigners, they have no idea what they are thinking, or they have no idea of what their reaction is or something.

A lot of using *honne/tatemae* is in trying to understand what the other is thinking and acting accordingly. The goal is to receive a good, harmonious reaction from the other. When a foreigner who is not in the group hierarchy is interacting, and when the foreigner is not using *honne/tatemae*, it causes the Japanese person to not be able to react to the usual cues in an interaction. It can result in this kind of scared feeling.

Previously, Hiroshi was quoted as saying that the way exchange students are assertive or voice opinions can be intimidating to Japanese people, or make them feel inferior. I informed him that when I told this to the exchange students they were surprised and concerned. I asked him how this might be broken down. He replied,

> First the best way is I think learning Japanese . . . like if a foreigner speaks Japanese they are becoming more Asian . . . or sounds Asian . . . we feel like same level or something.

Reflected in the above then is that the purpose of speaking Japanese is not only to understand language itself better, but to fit more into the group somewhere- "same level or something."

The property of *honne/tatemae* then was quite linked with the guest syndrome in the hierarchy category. Having status in any kind of hierarchy in Japan means belonging to a group. In order to belong to a group, one must be able to act according to the value of group identity and limit individualistic behavior, such as voicing strong opinions. One must be able to act in a way that will maintain group

harmony. A large part of this behavior is being able to use *honne/tatemae*. Using *tatemae* on the part of Japanese hosts served to keep the exchange students outside the hierarchy. Complementarily, exchange students not using *honne/tatemae* perpetuated their image as a guest and served to create barriers to being in the hierarchy.

Student Identity Property

Another property in the hierarchy category is student identity. The rationale for having this as a property in the hierarchy category may not be readily apparent. However, the identity that one has as a university student places one in the structure of society. The identity of being a student in a Japanese university is quite different than that of being a student in a North American university. This different identity was another factor that served to make the exchange students feel like guests. Jane relates identity to intellectual life:

> I do intellectual reading here just for fun because I'm so sick of not thinking right . . . going eight months without thinking is really frustrating . . . yea, you lose your self-identity and here you really need something.

The North American students in Kwansei Gakuin generally viewed intellectual stimulation and learning as primary reasons for attending a university. Without exception, all of the North American students in the study were disappointed by the nature of instruction and curriculum at Kwansei Gakuin, both in their exchange

program classes conducted in English, and in the mainstream classes which they attended.

On my very first day at the university, a woman from the exchange group which had just finished made a remark about the Japanese students at Kwansei Gakuin, "their brains are like mush." She went on to state her view that the university system works to discourage critical thinking and thus produce good workers. Alan stated "the classes that I have here, well, they are just lectures, the level of comprehension is just description, it's not analysis at all, and it doesn't make you think at all. It's high school level." Jane explained that she felt stifled and had not learned anything in any of the classes, "especially at this time of my life when I'm really gung-ho." This again relates back to North American students' need for intellectual stimulation. Jane also went on to greater description of the university system and her interpretation. This was after nine months at the university:

> I see it's just apathetic as hell. That's one thing that bugs me. There is no, it's like they've sacrificed their passion for their harmony is the way I've decided to look at it.

The Japanese university environment does seem to be more focused upon social relationships, rather than academic excellence. Most Japanese students agree that there is very little substantive work to be done during their university career, with the exception of their final thesis. The previously described club and circle society

reflects this. It is not unusual to see professors reading verbatim from books during their lectures- books that the students already possess.

This difference in the system causes some different perceptions regarding participation in classes between Japanese professors and students and North American professors and students.

Kenji, a Japanese student, had participated in both the exchange student classes (these were open to Japanese students proficient in English) and of course mainstream Japanese classes. He characterized the differences in participation in two areas. First, he said that in exchange student classes the students will eat and drink during class. Of course this can be a fairly common norm in North American university classes. However, in a Japanese classroom this is not allowed. This would be a major gaffe by a student in a Japanese classroom. The second area was in the area of talking to each other. In a Japanese classroom, the students often talk among each other. He said that in the exchange student classrooms, this happened less often. When it did happen, the North American students would still be listening to the class with one ear and when they wanted to interject or listen more carefully, they would easily turn off their conversation. It seems that the social life aspect of Japanese student life is carried out in the classroom, with students talking a lot to each other, even while the class

is being conducted. This was my own observation in the classes that I observed.

One visiting North American professor told me that he considered Japanese students to be immature because they talk among each other in class. He related how he had to resort to intervention techniques like separating students, something done in younger education levels in North America. I told this professor what I had learned from some of the North American students. It was obvious that attention was lacking in classes on the part of Japanese students. However, during club and circle meetings, the Japanese students could devote full attention for long periods of time, even after strenuous work-outs. I suggested to the North American professor that this paradox was due to the fact that clubs, as social activities, were more important to appropriately participate in than were classes. He winced at the suggestion and seemed uncomfortable with this thought.

As is becoming evident, student identity in North America is largely related to being a learner and being intellectually involved. The Japanese student identity is largely bound up in social activities. The primary structure for these at Kwansei Gakuin was clubs and circles. The clubs and circles are where one can see the hierarchical nature of university social life, reflected in the relationship of mentor/protege (*sempai/kohai*). This very important relationship at the university is an

explicit way to help students identify their status in the hierarchy.

In the university setting, upperclassmen are the *sempais*, or mentors, and lowerclassmen are *kohais*, or proteges. This relationship makes explicit the status one occupies in the hierarchy. *Kohais* look to *sempais* for direction, advice, and leadership. The *kohais* give status recognition to the *sempais* by treating them in the polite manner accorded to those of higher status.

When the Japanese students are attentively listening at their club meeting, it is because the person speaking is most likely their *sempai*, probably even the captain or leader of the club.

Whereas the North American professor viewed the Japanese students as being immature when talking in class, Japanese instructors with whom I talked considered North American students immature in the way that they asked questions.

One foreign professor remarked that Japanese students were like a wall, when trying to teach them. A Japanese student present thought the more appropriate metaphor was a sponge. The Japanese students soak up everything, but do not give anything back toward the instructor. Whichever metaphor is closer to the mark, the fact remains that in mainstream Japanese classes, students do not ask questions - at all. The classes are didactic in nature. When North American students attended a class taught by a Japanese

instructor, the nature of class discourse was not what the instructor was accustomed to. Regarding Japanese instructors, Neshek remarked "if you ask questions, it seems like it will put them off balance because they are not used to that." For many of the North American students, spontaneously asking questions in class and creating dialogue with an instructor was a learning style with which they were accustomed. The perception of one Japanese instructor was that this style of participation was immature. It showed a lack of patience and timing, as well as disrespect for the instructor's pace of teaching. Because of the didactic nature of classes in the Japanese university, questions for two-way communication were not something taken for granted. A question might only be asked to clarify something not totally understood. If this happened, then there was the risk that the instructor would receive the question as a signal that he did not teach effectively.

This form of participation in Japanese classes may look more like a form of non-participation to a foreigner. But if examined a little further, it appears that the forms of interaction in Japanese classrooms are intended to perpetuate the hierarchy which exists. It may even be considered a form of *tatemae*, in that students do not express opinions and the main foundation to the classes is again maintaining harmony.

Megumi attended one of the exchange student classes and discussed how she felt strange in the class because she felt like she had to be silent, whereas the North American students discussed many things. I asked her why Japanese students were usually silent in classes:

> Maybe they don't like to stick out in the class. You know just to keep harmony. And I think we should respect the teachers. . . [I ask how to respect the teachers] We can't disagree with the teacher's opinion and just I think listening is the best way to respect them.

This relates to the maturity notion. The way to look mature in a Japanese classroom is to follow the didactic mode and maintain harmony. The North American students were accustomed to a relatively more two-way style of education. In North America's system, if you can intelligently dialogue, and even debate with an instructor, it is a sign of maturity. Asking questions is certainly looked upon with positive regard in North America.

This difference in style of participation in classes has parallels in all discussion situations in Japan. A metaphor describing the difference between group discussion styles in Japan and North America is useful here. In Japan, group conversations/discussions resemble a bowling game and in North America they more closely resemble a tennis match. Sean had mentioned this metaphor to me in an interview and felt it was an accurate depiction.

When observing a Japanese group talking, you will see one person talking at a time, while everyone else politely

and patiently listens. When it is clear the one person is finished, then it will be the turn of someone else to "step up to the line and roll their ball down the lane", again while everyone politely listens. There is an awareness of whose turn it is to speak so that no one person dominates the conversation. Of course there would be some variations if one of the group members had significantly higher status. But if all of the group members are peers, this kind of bowling style of communication will occur. This style of course exists in the classroom also, except that the one rolling the ball is almost always the instructor. This style perpetuates the group identity and people's place within the group hierarchy.

When observing a North American group in discussion, it is usually quite different. When one person is finished speaking (or hitting the ball over the net), the quickest person on the other side of the net will speak next (return the ball). The whole conversation is like a tennis match. "The ball is on her side of the court now." The discussion is meant to stimulate and allow individual styles of communication to emerge, and foster an egalitarian basis where anyone can participate, not based upon their status, but based upon their ideas and knowledge. As in tennis, the ability to be quick in responding is usually a positive factor. In a previous section of this dissertation, Hiroshi recounted how his slow thoughtfulness in North America was viewed as not having any opinions and hence as

immature. There were several occasions when I was sitting in on a Japanese student group discussion (observing the bowlers) and a North American student would join the group in the middle of the discussion and try to interject something without surveying the state of the discussion and whose turn it might be, and waiting for his/her turn. The student would try to get everyone playing tennis in the middle of their bowling game, and then the whole discussion would quickly break up, or at least the part that had been happening prior to the North American's arrival.

When the North American students try to bring a tennis match into the classroom, the instructor and Japanese students may view this person as immature.

Another aspect of participation in classes relates to the Japanese adage that many people in the West are now familiar with, "the nail that sticks up will be pounded down." This is of course a reference to the group identity which so strongly exists in Japan. A student who asks questions and tries to be be active in class will not only be seen as immature, but also as arrogant and trying to show off. Megumi mentioned this not wanting to stick out. This person (nail) will soon be pounded down by classmates in some fashion.

The behaviors in Japanese university classes are not suited to intellectual discourse. Again, more importance is placed on social relations, and social relations depend upon maintaining harmony. Whereas a North American student

might look to a professor as an intellectual or academic mentor, Japanese professors often develop relationships that take place outside of the classroom. This may be in the form of coffee shop meetings, dinners, or cocktail hours. The course of conversations may approach academics during these meetings, but are more often on a friendly, personal basis.

During the second (spring) semester the North American students entered mainstream Japanese classes. This is a positive innovation on the part of Kwansei Gakuin. This did change their place in the hierarchy. The primary effect was that it improved their social relations with Japanese students, but it reinforced their disappointment with the academic system. The primary difference was that because the exchange students were taking some regular Japanese classes, they were viewed by the Japanese students as a member of their university, at least in a small way.

The second semester of regular Japanese class enrollment was beneficial for meeting more students and, more importantly, the Japanese students perceived the exchange students to be more similar to them in the hierarchy of the university. After all, they attended some of the same classes then. Attending regular courses seemed to alleviate some of the guest syndrome. It helped the Japanese students to place North American students somewhere in the hierarchy other than as a guest. So, in terms of fitting in and establishing more relationships,

the second semester of regular classes was useful. I did not find that it was a benefit in terms of academic gain in the classes where they were enrolled.

The academic and intellectual disappointment on the part of the North American students took away one avenue for pursuing where they fit in at the university and in Japan in general. In a North American university, intellectual and academic growth is one tangible area for building identity and esteem. If this outlet does not exist, then there needs to be something to compensate. The implication here is that students need to focus more on language and cultural learning, as well as interpersonal relationship development. The language and cultural learning can be enhanced by developing and maintaining good interpersonal relationships with people.

Gender Property

A third property in the **hierarchy** category is gender. Coming from a liberal, democratic, tolerant, and politically correct environment in the North American university system, the place of women in the university hierarchy presented some problems for North American students in their interactions with Japanese students.

Women's place in the hierarchy was best seen in the club context. After only one month in Japan, Alan had observed the hierarchy of the club to which he belonged:

> In the club, it's perfectly structured. There's no holes in the way that it works. Everyone has

> a place. There's 19 members and they know exactly where they stand. And on the bottom are two young girls.

These women are known as club managers. They are similar to the managers that high school sports teams have in North America. They take care of equipment, logistics, and other needs of the club members. Larry felt uncomfortable with this:

> But one thing I didn't like about the other club, I was playing with them, they had these girls just doing everything for us . . . [Larry explained how the girls even folded his shirts for him before returning them].

Many of the clubs do not allow women to join. There is a comprehensive list of clubs and circles which is circulated around the campus. On this listing, many indicate that women are not allowed. This was sometimes difficult for the North American women to accept. Said Margaret, "I went out to join the . . . club. They said no women, and I said look, I'm experienced, I can do it. [they said] No."

There were of course many clubs that women could join, but the North American women sometimes wanted to join clubs that did not allow women, or else the women involved in the club were managers, low in the hierarchy.

One of the ways people have social interactions and develop interpersonal relationships is by participating in activities of common interest. Women could not always join the clubs of their interest, and so it was a barrier to relationship development.

Alcohol Use Property

A fourth hierarchy property is alcohol use. The drinking of alcohol is used for a variety of reasons, besides recreation. One of the reasons people drink together is to become closer to one another. In general, when drinking, people can say most anything to each other. They can be more honest with someone not on the same hierarchical level. This applies to men more than women. It is acceptable for men to become totally drunk, but this is not the case for women. So, again, women could not really have this means at their disposal to break down hierarchy and increase honesty - another barrier for women.

For North American male students involved in clubs, drinking parties became a ritual that united team members together, regardless of their place in the hierarchy. However, you will see in Alan's experience that, even though drinking was used as a ritual for uniting, the process of the drinking party was still extremely hierarchical. The following story from Alan is long, but I think it is worth re-telling here. It has implications for hierarchy social interaction as well as friendship formation. The following is a portion of an interview which I conducted with Alan:

> Me- So how's that going with the other members [of club]? Are you and Bruce the only foreign members?
>
> Alan- It's working pretty well. Actually one of the things you'll probably find interesting, um at all the clubs they treat you really well.

They take you out for an initial dinner and it's paid for and that kind of thing.

Me- Who pays for it?

Alan- I'm not really sure but I think it's just the top older members. But Wednesday night we went out to unite the team, unify the team, because our first game was on Sunday night. They said we were going out drinking. I thought oh great, it sounds great. We went to a place just outside of school to one of these little Japanese bars, you know where it's kind of laid out with little tables and everyone sits around [on the floor] . . . We went in and it looked really nice and I was really excited, there were 24 of us going in. Sit down and all this food is brought out. I sat down. We have seven managers - girls, who manage the team. There's 24 guys. So there were a lot of girls hanging around, smiling and not saying very much. I had the head girl on one side and the assistant captain on the other side. It's kind of how we ended up sitting more than anything. So we were sitting there and the fourth year guys wouldn't let the first year guys eat yet. So I was like OK I can understand why here that would happen.

Me- But they were eating and you were eating with the fourth year guys?

Alan- Yea, so we're all eating away and I started to notice the first year guys were starting to get kind of red in the face and I couldn't understand why. And the fourth year guys were making them drink. They were just saying, drink and so they'd fill up the glass and say *itadakimasu* and boom *gochisoosamadeshita* [honorifics for taking and giving thanks for food and drink]. You know it was great thanks a lot, drink again, yea OK, fill it up and drink again.

Me- Beer or sake?

Alan- Beer. In small glasses. And they're jut putting them back.

Me- With no food?

Alan- With no food and they had been practicing for three hours. And the end of the day. So in another 15 minutes they are totally red in the face from drinking so much. And it's all the first years, because they're all first on the

team and then the second years who are into the first year on the team. So Bruce [other exchange student] was there too. And Bruce and I should be doing this, like it's unusual for third year guys to join the team I think. But because we're foreigners we were omitted from this total drunk fest. And so we're all just sitting there going drink drink drink and um the leaders and a couple of the older guys, graduates who had been in the track club like years before, the Old Boys [alumni] they're just sitting there going drink drink and these guys are just kind of huddling around them in groups around all the older guys and um I really felt sorry for them so I wasn't too much on making them drink. And um so after about 20 minutes they began to throw up. And um first of all the girl beside me whipped out all these black garbage bags onto the table and I said hey what's going on, what are we going to do, is this some kind of game? It looks great (laughter). I thought, like it's a totally great looking dinner and I'd never been to one of these bars before and it was kind of novel and it looked really cool. Everything was still and pretty quiet. They were still making them drink but it wasn't like a rowdy party or anything. It was just kind of chillin' after practicing for three hours, pretty tired. So they started to throw up and all these garbage bags started whipping out, big black garbage bags. And they're just throwing up like crazy, and the other guys are drink drink and they're not drunk yet.

Me- You mean after they're throwing up they're still telling them to drink?

Alan- Oh yea, for about an hour and a half. So they've been throwing up for about an hour and a half and uh it was just grim, just grim. They had these big bags heavy by this point and I was watching them go wild and this was kind of crazy. They'd come by me you know and they'd sit there you know big, wide red eyes going you know make me drink kind of thing. So I'd fill their glass up kind of half-way and then I'd do a *kampai* [cheers] so we'd both have to drink it. And uh that worked pretty well. I felt really sorry for these guys. I couldn't believe it. So we did that for about an hour and a half. One guy got up to the front of the room, one of the first year guys and um he started to say something. I didn't understand what he was saying um and uh he ended up having someone pass him a bottle, so

he'd drink a bunch and then throw up and keep drinking and by this point they are all really drunk and everyone else is fairly tipsy but nobody else got really drunk at all.

Me- Because they're eating?

Alan- They're just not drinking heavily, middle of the week. And then there was the oldest second year guy. He was really important to the team [ability]. They got him up drinking and he's known for being a really weak drinker and so he threw up and then drank another bottle and a half. So he drank two of those big bottles. So in 20 minutes he was just looped. He was so drunk.

Me- Gosh, I'm really starting to feel queasy just thinking about it.

Alan- A wild night. So I asked, how often do we do this? And they're like every month. So every month they do this and first year guys just sit there and throw up, same thing. I was like wow, of course it took me about 25 minutes to get that through [understand]. Conversations are great, it's charades a lot of the time. But there are only a couple of guys on the team who speak English well. So that's where I'm picking up a lot of Japanese . . . And then what happened was that guy making a speech took his shirt off and they sang the school song which actually starts out in German, which I was kind of surprised at . . . So they sang the song, I tried to go along with it. I didn't know it at all. This guy walked up and down, you know a first year, and everyone just slapped his back, just belted him, and then he challenged someone else and he went through all kinds of people, and the captain and the Old Boys were walking around and giving him a slap and they slapped him on the back until he couldn't walk anymore and he'd be on the ground because his legs would give out from the pain. A wild night.

Me- Wait, this was after they were drunk already?

Alan- Yea, it was the last thing we did and then we broke up and everyone went home. So it was kind of a crazy night. That's culture. At the end the last guy to do it was one of the Old Boys and they had him with his shirt off and then he undid his belt and you know was kind of making to

do something um you know undid his fly . . . and so he came over to me and and he was like OK do the same thing and wants me to undo my belt and I'm like I don't have a clue as to what is going on here, and I thought I'm going to sit this one out.

Me- Wait, this is still in the restaurant?

Alan- Yea, we're still in the restaurant, it's totally private . . . So I was like no I'm going to sit this one out and stuff . . . And so he ended up mooning the whole crowd and walking around and stuff. That was kind of cool, but I had no idea where it was going and you know, bunch of people I don't know, I was just kind of sit this one out and see what happens. Afterwards I got a bit of a talk about what friendship is in Japan. And uh not only do we have fun together but we also suffer together.

Me- Who was talking to you?

Alan- The older boy and then the assistant captain and then one of the other guys. Again it took a while because we were doing the Japanese acting out thing, but yea that's what they told me and I was like, yea I understand and they're like we have to get you to know more Japanese customs. And uh to understand better and then you'll have more fun, and then we'll all become closer. I was like yea OK great I'll learn through experience. So it was kind of interesting.

Me- Did they use the English word suffer, we suffer together?

Alan- No, it was more a kind of good times, hard times kind of thing. The point was we are together through good times and bad times. It occurred to me, in part, that there aren't really any bad times here.

Me- [laughing] yea so we'll make our own.

Alan- [laughing] I haven't really been to practice since then.

The scenario which Alan described showed excessive drinking as a mechanism which reflected the hierarchy of the group. The upperclassmen and the Old Boys were

controlling the underclassmen. This whole thing is similar to hazing in a North American university context. However, the difference is that this episode is not a one-time deal. As they told Alan, it often happens. Additionally, a ritual like hazing seems to be designed to break down hierarchy. It is a rite of passage. Upon completion the person who underwent the hazing can now be considered "one of us." The drinking party in Japan serves to increase relationship development, but it does this at the same time as reinforcing club hierarchy.

An interesting point in Alan's scenario was when he was asked to unbuckle his pants. It being an extremely ambiguous situation, he decided to not participate and see what happened. Perhaps this was a point where the group was trying to make a transition in their relationship with Alan, not treating him as a guest, which they had most of the evening, but wanting him to suffer with them. They explained this notion of friends suffering together afterwards and suggested that he needed to learn more about Japanese customs.

The North American students noticed early on that drinking seems to excuse most anything. In fact, a man can drink and act any way that he wants and then the next day not feel any remorse for his behavior. In the previous scenario described by Alan, it was seen how ritual drinking can reinforce hierarchy in a group. Drinking together can also temporarily break down hierarchical relationships and

allow people to be more open and honest. One Japanese professor told me, " drinking together is a very important strategy to accept and learn about each other for Japanese. In such situations even direct expressions of their feelings and opinions are almost always allowed." An invitation to drink also was a gesture for acceptance into the group. The same professor said, " And to be invited to drink together after such a long latent process of observation often means to be recognized as a member."

On another occasion Alan was talking about more informal drinking outings, " Well we went out drinking a couple of times and whenever the beer opens, have a sip, the whole thing [hierarchy] dissolves right there." This does not mean to say that the hierarchical relations are ever completely out of mind, though. Alan went on to say, " but whoever has to order the next round it will always be the youngest guy doing all the work and stuff."

Strategies Property

The fourth property for **hierarchy** was strategies for adapting to the hierarchical situation. While there were a variety of strategies, in varying degrees of magnitude, and by various numbers of people, I am going to describe the strategies which are useful for understanding the overall case of this group. There were three basic types of strategies which the North American students used to

reconcile their position in the hierarchical structures in which they found themselves.

One was actions that tried to influence the environment around them to break down the hierarchy. This was not always done consciously. Sean was on a club in which there was one member who was the butt of everyone else's jokes. The boy's nickname was "vomit", in Japanese of course. One day Sean encouraged this boy to say something back to the group protesting this treatment. This comment embarrassed the Japanese boy. Sean went on to relate that his encouragement to say something was a result of his egalitarian values. He perceived this boy as being treated as less than equal. After he saw the reaction and talked with the boy, he realized that this was the boy's place in the hierarchy.

Larry was a North American student who had a strong feeling against the hierarchy he encountered in Japan. Although he ws an extreme case, his thoughts and strategy illuminate possible North American reactions to the hierarchy. Larry felt the hierarchy structure to be a barrier to friendship development. "Really I'd like to meet people and see them as good friends, buddies type thing, but every time I meet Japanese people, especially in organizations, in groups, it turns out to be hierarchy every time." Larry was active in club activity and early on he felt the club hierarchy:

> The thing I noticed was with the clubs you know there is so much hierarchy. Everything is like

> Alan said, rank and file and regimented . . . It's just kind of hard for us to fit into that you know . . . I think all that hierarchy stuff is a big joke you know, but they're taking it seriously. I'm like hey guys calm down, cool down, but that's really fun.

Larry felt uncomfortable with the hierarchy and in another conversation, it seems he viewed it as a power structure and was bothered by some having more power than others. At the end of his quote above, he seemed to think that hierarchy causes people to take things too seriously, and he was trying to make it light, I think in his own mind as well as the Japanese students'.

Larry didn't see himself as a part of the hierarchy in clubs and his main strategy was to change the structure of hierarchy through his behavior with Japanese clubmates. After being in a club for one month, Larry remarked, "But since I've joined them [clubs] I can see that things are starting to change a bit." In a group interview, Larry asked another student who was discussing hierarchy, "Did you manage to break it down any? Like get the guys laughing and joking with each other?"

Larry's main method for change seems to be humor and lightness:

> I don't know, we've become pretty good friends I think with the captain . . . now everything is starting to be a little more Western. I don't know we're joking around and stuff like that. I walked up to him [captain] and like hey Taka [Larry acts out playfully hitting the captain on the arm] and you know just joke around with him.

Larry associated humor and lightness with Western behavior. It seemed that he associated the hierarchy of

the group with formality also. For North American university students, who highly value informality, the formal feel of the club hierarchy may not be appealing.

One other aspect of Larry's strategy was his formulation of self-image - his identification with the foreigner *[gaijin]* group in Japan. In discussing one of the clubs he belonged to, he stated,

> I guess they're kind of like, he's a foreigner so we'll just let him do whatever he wants, so when everybody else says *shitsurei shimasu* [literally means "I am being rude", it is what one says when leaving the group before the rest of the members] I just say see you later and what's up and stuff like that.

Larry felt that he was outside the hierarchy and did not fit in the existing one, so he had a kind of license to act almost anyway he wanted.

Unfortunately, I could not find anyone in Larry's clubs to interview, in order to check on their perceptions of his strategy. He had chosen not to follow some of the standard rituals of hierarchy and even politeness. He didn't treat the club captain with deference and didn't say *shitsurei shimasu* when leaving the group. My interpretation is that the rituals and politeness felt too formal for him, and therefore he didn't feel that desirable interpersonal relationships were developing. He chose not to assimilate into the hierarchy, but to try and change it.

The guest (*okyakusan*) syndrome was described earlier. The North American students expressed frustration at being treated like guests throughout their stay. Their position

as a guest placed them somewhere in the hierarchy and allowed Japanese people to then have some sort of framework in which to treat them. However, I observed that they sometimes used this treatment by Japanese people as a strategy for dealing with hierarchy. When it was within personal boundaries and comfort zone, then the students did not want to be perceived as guests. A simple example of this is the use of chopsticks. As a foreigner in Japan, Japanese guests act surprised and are effusively complimentary regarding foreigners' use of chopsticks. Sometimes a host will bring a spoon and fork to a foreigner, thinking they may prefer this and try to accommodate them. Then the foreigner is frustrated and wonders will he/she never quit being treated like a guest.

However, there were other times when North American students did not choose to adapt their behavior, thereby reinforcing their position outside the Japanese hierarchy and staying within the guest position. In a previous scenario with Alan, he did not unbuckle his pants and later "moon" the group, as he did not feel comfortable with it. All evening he had been treated as a guest, not having to get staggeringly drunk like the other new club members. The point came when the club offered him the opportunity to join somewhere into the hierarchy and he chose not to.

Larry also sometimes did not take the opportunity to leave the guest position. One of the rituals in club activity is that new members (usually freshmen) are

responsible for cleaning up after club activities. Regarding the first club he joined, Larry remarked, "I was like man, no way, they had me like cleaning the floor and I said forget that." Conversely, Mary chose to enter the Japanese hierarchy and did this cleaning up after club practice. "Yea, I do clean up afterwards and help set up the equipment in the beginning . . . I do it voluntarily, it's no problem."

Even though I could not talk to anyone directly involved with Larry, other Japanese informants expressed their positive attitude toward North Americans who adopted Japanese customs. When Alan had refused to unbuckle his pants at the drinking party, other members "came down" on him and told him he needed to learn more about Japanese customs. This reflected a desire on the part of the Japanese people to bring the North American students somewhere into the hierarchical structure, when these opportunities for leaving the guest position were offered. When the friendship category is examined, the relationship between hierarchy and friendship will become evident. In order to become friends with someone, they have to be somewhere in your hierarchy, somewhere more involved than as a guest.

Another strategy could be called clarifying your identity as a foreigner within Japanese social hierarchy. This of course is a process which all foreign sojourners go through in their cultural adjustment. Alan and Larry

provided some concrete examples of how this process was translated into behavioral choices. It has to do with assimilation, defining personal boundaries and deciding how far one can go in assimilation while still maintaining personal identity. This has to do with a psychological process that is on-going while living in the foreign culture. Neshek described his thinking process:

> I mean you don't want to become a Japanese person . . . because if you give up your sense of a *gaijin*, as a foreigner, then not only, you're making the Japanese, you're kind of forcing them to try and fit you into the social hierarchy somewhere. And it just confuses them and it doesn't make you look good. . . I find the best thing to do is to be a person who is a foreigner who has respect for the customs, but at the same time does not lose his identity in trying to integrate with society . . . You have to keep your own sense of identity, as least I do, I mean I can't deal with just blending into the group. Sometimes if I'm feeling like a vegetable I can deal with it for a while. But I can't live like that for a long period of time because it attacks my ego.

Neshek's thoughts bring up several points that are relevant to strategies for dealing with hierarchy. First, he talked of the importance of maintaining your own identity, for yourself. Most of the North American students' background, gave them an identity that included values of egalitarianism, individuality, honesty/ directness, informality, and earned status. The dilemma was how to maintain this but still fit into a hierarchy, a hierarchy which rests on the values of hierarchy, group identity, maintaining harmony, prescribed status, and formality. Neshek even associated the group identity with

the metaphor of being a vegetable. Secondly, Neshek recognized the change for the people when interacting with foreigners. He said that figuring out where to put foreigners in the hierarchy can be confusing for Japanese people.

Sean's thoughts along these lines were reflected in a group interview just after the mid-point of the exchange students' stay:

> When I first joined the team, I had a lot of problems trying to fit in, trying to fit into the hierarchy. Having a lot of problems with that, and really first of all, just trying to understand what was going on and secondly trying to put myself in there somewhere. And over the last little while I've realized that's not going to happen. Because I'm not, I'm an exchange student with this club and they don't expect to treat me, I don't think they want to treat me like a regular member, and when it comes down to it, I thought about this a little while ago, I don't think I want to be treated like a regular member [laughter from group] . . . But I've decided the boundary anyway and if it pushes me a little farther out that's not a big opportunity cost kind of thing because I'm not here just to try to fit into this group that I will never fit in to. I'm a little more happy with myself with this and I think in the beginning I had this expectation.

Sean was one of the most successful of the North American students in developing positive interpersonal relationships with Japanese people. The expectation he referred to at the end was that he would assimilate into Japanese culture as much as possible. He expressed feeling guilty and awkward at the beginning of his stay because he felt that he wasn't adjusting right. As opposed to Larry's strategy, Sean decided he would not change the structure,

but fit into the existing one. He didn't think that Japanese people would take into account him being a foreigner and therefore that they would have the same expectations of him that they had for other Japanese members of their group. He of course quickly learned this was not so, that the expectations were different.

Sean's strategy was a combination of reconciling yourself first and foremost as a foreigner outside the hierarchy, but then doing whatever is within your personal limits to adapt to the customs and hierarchy.

In an earlier section of this chapter, it was shown that Sean tried to fit in by learning *keigo*. The Japanese language reflects the hierarchy and a good example of this is honorific language - *keigo*. Sean discovered that his use of language was not helping him to fit into the hierarchy of the club during the first half year of his involvement with the club.

This also has to do with the *sempai-kohai* system. Sean was a third year student at the beginning of the year. Therefore, he was a *sempai* (mentor) to the first and second year students. He related though, how his language in the beginning was too polite. He was using polite language with his *kohais*, the second and third year students. "At the start, I tried to follow all the rules of the club. I was careful, and I was not respected, in terms of language." Additionally, after April, the beginning of the new school year (exchange students' second half of stay),

Sean was a senior (fourth year student). He said he became more relaxed and treated the underclassmen less politely, both in language and actions:

> If I missed a class or something, I wouldn't politely ask for the notes, I'd say, do you have the notes, can I have them,in Japanese. And I think that they, there started to become a change there, for the better. Because I was acting a bit more like a senior, I was acting a bit more confident and I was acting a little bit more like you're a junior, you're below me, give me your notes . . . so I have no juniors that address me now in friendly style, it's a complete change around and it's really been an education.

Sean went on to relate that at the beginning of the stay, when he first joined the club, he told them how old he was, that he was a fourth year, a senior. He got some indication that he should be treated like a *sempai* because of this. He ate lunch with the fourth years and he practiced with the fourth years. However, he was not getting the respectful language from the *kohais*. He thought maybe the duration in the club had something to do with your status, but then he discovered that it was based primarily upon age and that the other factors were minor.

Recalling Larry's negative judgment of hierarchy, his was an example of a typical Western reaction to hierarchy. Because of relatively egalitarian values, Westerners may view the status situation in a hierarchy as negative. This feeling on the part of Westerners can cause them to not adapt to the situation. One of the exchange students said that she did not get involved with clubs at all because she did not like the hierarchy. Not only can it cause

difficulties and barriers to getting involved for the foreigner, but the foreigners' lack of adaptation when they are involved may cause confusion and barriers for the Japanese students. Larry wanted to try and change the system, and this could have made the Japanese members of the club uncomfortable in some way. In Sean's case, he did not consciously want to change the hierarchical system, but in the beginning he unwittingly used the incorrect form of language with the *kohais* and he thinks that it not only was a barrier but that it made the Japanese *kohais* uncomfortable as well. Sean spoke of when he first started to use more familiar language with the *kohais*:

> I tried that [familiar language], the first time I started, I got a good reaction back, like I got someone feeling better about our relationship. I mean I really saw that in their face. They kind of, it was like some kind of big relief washed over their face, like now I know he's a *sempai*, now I know where I stand. I know where he stands. But it did seem that it seemed a little more comfortable.

Another simple language related strategy was suggested by Hiroshi. If the exchange students address their host parents using the Japanese words for father (*otoosan*) and mother (*okaasan*), the host parents will feel more comfortable. They will know where they stand and will understand it in hierarchical terms. A thought enters here that some North American children address their parents with the parents' first name, striving for egalitarianism.

Earlier it was seen that Japanese students sometimes felt intimidated or perhaps inferior, or at least scared in

interactions with North American students. One of the reasons was because the Japanese students didn't know what the North American students were thinking or how they might react in a situation. They were not sure the interaction would remain harmonious. Since they did not really understand their relationship in terms of status with the exchange student, they were scared, or maybe even felt inferior. Conversely, North Americans may be likely to associate vertical status in a hierarchy with an inferior vs. superior notion. Larry certainly felt this way. He felt that the lower status people in clubs and groups were somehow treated in an inferior fashion. However, for people who live within an explicit hierarchical structure, there is not this inferior vs. superior feeling attached to the hierarchical relationships. Rather, the hierarchy functions as a structure to maintain harmony in group relations and strengthen group cohesion.

In Sean's previous quote he mentioned how relief was seen in the *kohai* faces and that now they knew where they stood and where Sean stood, once he used language that reflected the status in their relationship. They could then clearly see that they were his *kohai* and therefore they understood how to act in order to suit their status and could then maintain harmony in the group.

Sean compared the different way that a Westerner and Japanese person would respond to the same treatment. He said that he spoke "more roughly" to his Japanese *kohais*

than he would to someone in English. He said, "but this is, this is not just, language is not just the words right, it's the vehicle to communicate, right?" He said that the Japanese *kohai* would not understand if he spoke politely to him about something he had done wrong. He remarked that when he spoke roughly to a *kohai* for a mistake he had made, the *kohai* acted very polite and actually thanked him. Sean remarked, "I mean, if that was a Westerner, that person would have felt a little like, I mean it wouldn't have worked right?" If it had been a Westerner he/she may have been offended or insulted by Sean's rough language.

Sean found a way to fit into the hierarchy, thereby making himself and the Japanese students in the club more comfortable. Still, Sean understood that he was not completely in the hierarchy, nor would he ever be:

> Yes, I've got my little niche there. And my niche is way outside the club, albeit. But they know I'm there. I'm sort of the off, out of the club, but still the *sempai*, still deserve some respect. But it's not a real core member of the club, so I go off and do my own thing and it's great.

In the section on *honne/tatemae*, Sean expressed this notion that foreigners are always basically outside the group, but can do a lot to fit in where possible. Some contrasts between Larry and Sean's strategy were reflected by my interview with Mr. Suzuki, who developed a good relationship with Sean. They were in the same club. On the issue of expectations from Japanese people about adapting to Japanese culture, or Japanese people changing

because of interactions with foreigners, I asked Mr. Suzuki if club members changed at all around Sean.

> There's no difference. We are all acting and behaving in a usual way, so if there's anyone who is changed, it should be Sean . . . I think it's important that the foreign students show me that they are trying to learn Japanese custom and that they are trying to learn Japanese language. They don't have to be good, but they have to show they are trying.

Mr. Suzuki expressed satisfaction in Sean's effort to adapt to the customs. He particularly mentioned that Sean always used *shitsurei shimasu* when entering or leaving the group. This is in contrast to Larry's strategy of saying "what's up" instead of *shitsurei shimasu*. Sean reconciled himself to not totally fitting in, but still maintained politeness, which is very important, and followed some basic Japanese customs while displaying an effort to fit in. When he finally reconciled himself to not totally fitting into the hierarchy, he became happy. This was the strategy that most of the exchange students eventually utilized - reconciling to themselves that they would never truly fit into the hierarchy, and that their first and foremost identity was that of a foreign student.

North American students found barriers to forming interpersonal relationships because they could not totally fit into the hierarchy, unless they were content with their position as a guest. One successful strategy was to adjust expectations and understand that your first identity in Japan is that of a foreigner.

They also found that academic and intellectual life was lacking, and this also was another limitation in establishing relationships. Intellectual pursuits as a common interest with other Japanese students usually did not occur. Given these barriers, another strategy emerged, and I call this the creation of the "pack mentality." The North American students' primary relationship group became themselves. This strategy is an offshoot of the clarification of identity strategy. They recognized that they would not fit into the hierarchy totally, but still needed a group where they would totally fit in. Therefore, they established the exchange student group as their primary support and friendship network. I was surprised that not even one student dissociated from this group and tried to go to a very high level of assimilation. Even Sean, who was quite successful in establishing positive interpersonal relationships, became a member of this group:

> We came here as individuals and didn't know each other, but you know it's the *Kwangaku ryugakusei* [Kwansei Gakuin exchange students] against the world. Some of us have tried to break off, some of us have tried to include Japanese people in the group, but by and large it's this huge white group, an organism unto itself.

Sean's phrase of "against the world" spawned my use of the term, "pack mentality." The exchange student group was of course very visible on campus, especially at the beginning of the stay. Sean's comment was made after two months at Kwansei Gakuin. It was most visible on "the

green", the large grassy area in the middle of the campus. Most of the classroom buildings surrounded the green. During free times, and while waiting for classes to begin, a large group of foreign students could be seen together on the green. This also occurred in the lunchroom, where exchange students usually sat together.

This pack mentality was a reflection of what the exchange students observed with their Japanese student people. Most of the students spent their time together with small close-knit groups. These groups usually consisted of club members. These close-knit groups could be observed on the green and in the cafeteria as well. Of course they were not as obvious as the exchange student group. Exchange students were intimidated and shy to try and enter these groups, even if they belonged to the same club. Mary expressed this after one month on campus:

> I see my friends from the team in the cafeteria and say hello to them. But I'm sort of a little afraid to sit with them, maybe a little shy, a little nervous. I can tell they're a really close-knit group and I don't see myself being a part of that group yet . . . I'd like to sit with them and chat with them, but I don't think I'm, I'm still definitely an outsider for their group and think that if I sat in on lunch with them because they're always sitting as a group, because they're always in that same place in the cafeteria, I'd feel like I was intruding.

Just as it was difficult for the exchange students to break through the in-group barrier, it was difficult for the Japanese students to break through the exchange student pack mentality. As one Japanese student, Mari, said two months after the arrival of the exchange students, " I

think it's the biggest problem. When I see them they, most of them are always hanging around together . . . and so when I see them I sometimes wonder why they came to Japan."

As a strategy for dealing with hierarchy, being a member of the North American group was probably more of a non-strategy. It placed their position farther outside the Japanese hierarchy. I don't think this was a conscious choice, at first. The exchange students needed a support group and a group in which they could process their experience as foreign students. They also needed a venue for intellectual stimulation. Their own group of exchange students could fulfill these needs.

As the year wore on, the pack mentality still existed, although not in as extreme a degree. It was more common to see exchange students with Japanese students at lunch or on the green. It was also more common to see Japanese students mixing with the larger exchange student group on the green and in the cafeteria. However, the pack was still there, and after the middle of the year it was a conscious choice on the part of the exchange students to sacrifice some opportunities for more interactions with Japanese students in order to maintain their affiliation with the exchange student group. Some of the reasons for sacrificing this opportunity is discussed in the friendship category analysis.

Summary of Hierarchy Category

The hierarchy category consisted of six interrelated properties; the guest syndrome, *honne/tatemae* communication, student identity, gender, alcohol use, and strategies.

The overall experience of the exchange students was a quest for fitting into the hierarchy somewhere. Not understanding the *honne/tatemae* style of communication hindered their ability to learn about the hierarchy and find a satisfying place in it. The North American students were largely disappointed with the Japanese university in terms of academic and intellectual stimulation. This meant that they did not have the option of seeing themselves as an intellectual, which would be a place in the hierarchy in a North American setting. Being a female sometimes caused an insurmountable obstacle to fitting into a desired place in the hierarchy. Drinking rituals for males were a mechanism for integrating an outsider into the hierarchy.

There were basically three strategies employed by the North American students in dealing with the hierarchy. One was to try and change the existing structure and make it more Western. Another was to reconcile oneself to being first and foremost a foreigner, but then doing whatever is possible to fit in. The third related strategy was to not actively try and fit in completely, but to accept the exchange student group as the primary identity group.

Main Findings - Friendship Category

The second category for discussion is friendship. It may seem quite obvious that a large part of the experience for a university student in any situation is making friends. This was identified in the literature review as a large factor in developing interpersonal relationships and can greatly contribute to a successful study abroad experience.

As was shown in the hierarchy discussion, the exchange students were disappointed with the academic and intellectual life at Kwansei Gakuin. This increased the need for good interpersonal relations to develop in order to have a successful stay. Effective interpersonal relations were largely defined in terms of friendship on the part of the North American students, especially at the beginning of their stay. An examination of how friendship takes on different forms in Japanese and North American cultures will be undertaken.

In the previous section on the category of hierarchy, it was seen that a lot of the interpersonal relationship experience for exchange students was trying to figure out where they fit in, and how they would go about fitting in. If one is primarily outside the hierarchy and largely perceived as a guest by Japanese people, it presents obstacles in the formation of friendship. Indeed, in the following analysis and interpretation of friendship formation, it becomes evident that the question of where

the students fit in the group hierarchy caused some hindrances in the development of friendships. Conversely, the differences between the North American and Japanese students also at times provided a ready-made common ground with which they could get to know each other. North American students were there to learn about Japanese people and culture and the Japanese people, whom they got to know, were curious and interested to know about foreigners also.

Overall, the North American students did develop some friendships during their stay at Kwansei Gakuin. In varying degrees they did become involved with Japanese friends and participated in a variety of social activities with them. They found Japanese people to be good people and enjoyed learning about Japanese culture. However, in the strictly interpersonal area, the North American students' initial expectations regarding friendship development by and large were not met. As briefly described in the overview of relationship development, there were not any deep friendships developed in the minds of the exchange students.

The properties in the friendship category are definition of friendship, initial interactions, time orientation, and hanging out vs. structure.

Initial Interactions Property

First up is initial interactions. In order to set the stage for the larger discussion of this category, it is

necessary to get a picture of what kind of interactions exchange students had with Japanese people, in order to get to know them and start developing relationships. In the relationship overview, there was a brief description of interaction contexts, in which the setting for interactions was listed. For example, this included on-campus out of class situations, in the host family house, eating and drinking together, and participation in clubs and circles. These were forms in which interactions could take place. This initial interactions piece actually gets into the content within those forms of interaction. Hopefully, the reader will be able to see in his/her mind some of these interactions occurring.

The first part of this is a description of initial interactions. These occurred for the first month or two. The North American students arrived ready to meet people and to begin establishing relationships. Meeting places were on-campus informally, the coffee hours that the International Office held, and the first involvement with clubs and circles.

Of course a very germane aspect of initial interactions, and to some extent interactions over the entire period of stay, was language differences. Upon arrival, the Japanese language facility of the exchange students was limited. Even though they had studied in North America and were not starting from the very beginning, they were not accustomed to interacting in a

meaningful and sustained way in Japanese. Therefore, there was a mix of interactions in both Japanese and English in the beginning. The shallowness of conversations that the exchange students describe could be partly attributed to their lack of language fluency. After three months of knowing a few exchange students, Ms. Kawaguchi remarked, "Since their [exchange students] Japanese is very polite, when we have a conversation it's often exchanging questions, like what do you eat or something like that. Once in a while somebody says a joke but it's still a very polite conversation."

In an earlier part of this chapter, there was a discussion of how Sean learned *keigo* (honorific Japanese) in order to fit in better. Honorific Japanese could be used in formal situations and with people of high status, such as professors. On the other hand, another barrier for North American students in language acquisition was that their language was sometimes too formal for their Japanese friends. When learning Japanese, one usually learns more polite forms of Japanese first, even if not the very formal language, *keigo*. Students are not that adept at familiar forms of Japanese. This presents a barrier in talking with friends.

So in the beginning, many of the conversations were with Japanese students who could speak some English, at least the conversations that went into any depth. When the exchange students first met Japanese students there was a

remarkable similarity in the initial talk. The same questions were usually asked by the Japanese students. The first was asking where you're from, the second was asking where you live now, and Jane remarked on the third question, "I mean of course the number three topic was do I have a boyfriend." The same applied for male students, being asked if they had a girlfriend. The boyfriend/girlfriend question made many of the exchange students uncomfortable. It seemed to be too private a question to be asking when first meeting someone. This homogeneity in terms of initial conversations was mentioned by most of the exchange students. Hillary said, "If you memorize a conversation, you could put it on every situation because they all ask you the same questions." Exchange students felt there was a lack of "original" conversations.

This asking about boyfriends and girlfriends bothered some of the exchange students, feeling this was a personal area that would not normally be discussed in the first meeting. When I asked Kimiko about the exchange students adapting or not, she used the example of exchange students answering private questions or not. She said that Japanese people will ask foreign students private questions. She remarked how Sean was perceived positively because he answered any question. "So when we get the answer from them [exchange students] like we can be friends." She then spoke of another exchange student who would change the

subject or try other ways of not answering private questions. "He like didn't open up himself to us, so we're sad he hates us." Her use of the word hate may have been extreme due to a language difference, but nevertheless Sean was regarded more positively for his openness.

When I asked Kimiko why it was common for the exchange students to be asked private questions, she said the following:

> Japanese feel we are the same. So we should know each other, I mean we should know everything. [I ask what the case is with Westerners]. They think individual life is most important. So it's very natural for them to lead the different lives.

She then went on to explain that this then was a way to get to know North American students better. This again relates back to *honne/tatemae* and the discussion of opinions. The Japanese students were likely to talk about girlfriends, love, or family and life history in order to get to know someone in the beginning. They would avoid opinions or strong views on topical types of conversation. For the exchange students, these more private questions can actually function as disrupters of the harmony in a conversation. The Western value of privacy may cause these questions to be too close and therefore make the person feel uncomfortable. Conversely, the discussion of views on other topics, such as politics or other topics requiring personal opinion to discuss, would not affect the harmony of a conversation for Western students, but may for Japanese students. One successful strategy for exchange

students in dealing with these private questions was to go ahead and "just do it" by going along with it in order to maintain group harmony and find their way into the structure somehow.

Another aspect of *honne/tatemae* here is language. The Japanese students know that the Japanese language level of the exchange students is not very high, especially in the beginning. So in order to maintain harmony in the conversation, the Japanese students would carefully consider using Japanese language the exchange students would understand or English that they know they could make understandable for the exchange students.

When Japanese people are thinking about how the other will react to their talk, they try to prevent the other from having to react in a confused way. This confusion would break up harmony for both people. If the receiver does not understand something, not only does it cause discomfort on the receiver's part, but their reaction will cause discomfort on the speaker's part. The confusion on the part of the receiver could be a reflection of the speaker's ability to make himself/herself understood. Consider a common mistake that many foreigners make in Japan. When they do not understand something the Japanese person said in Japanese, the foreigner will naturally practice good two-way communication by saying "I don't understand" (*wakarimasen*). They then might expect the Japanese person to say the same thing in a different way,

or formulate a different question. One soon finds out though, the usual response back to "I don't understand" is ceasing the conversation or talking about something else, or the Japanese person will go into English, if they are able. In effect, saying "I don't understand" means "you really did not do a very good job of making yourself understood." It disrupts the harmony in the situation.

In Megumi's previous quote she expressed that Japanese people feel they are all the same, that they should know each other. Since they did not know exchange students and since exchange students were more individualistic, these private questions were more often asked.

This relates to the concept of life course. As Mr. Seiya expressed, "Japanese people deeply depend on the similarity of their life courses." He went on to give examples of the differences between family members and guests, full-time lecturer vs. part-time lecturer, and Japanese students and exchange students. Much of one's relationship with another is recognized from the framework of life course. People will view others from the perspective of whether or not they share this same life course.

In Japan one can see how homogeneity creates similar life courses for Japanese people, no matter what their individual jobs or education. Then on another level, people with similar careers and education have an even more similar life course. In the university system one sees

that everyone takes the entrance exam and enters university at the same time. Then everyone has the same concern of getting a job upon graduation. Not many Japanese graduates can take off a couple of years to travel or adventure after graduation and then come back and find a place in the employment system. This kind of deviation would take them out of the similar life course of other Japanese university graduates. Even studying abroad for a Japanese student can cause problems in this regard, as they often will have to attend university for an extra year. If one does share a similar life course with someone else or a group, they are considered *nakama* (a member). If it is not the case, the person would be seen as *okyakusan* (guest).

From the beginning, exchange students were viewed as guests, if only because of cultural differences. They were perceived as having a different life course and therefore the initial interactions were a striving on the part of the Japanese people to get to know them, to see where they fit in. This life course is one factor in explaining treatment as guests and in the initial conversations with people.

The exchange students' perception of shallowness in relationships with Japanese people was due in large part to the perceived shallowness of conversations. Japanese people also expressed at times that they would like to have had more in-depth conversations. While this was sometimes the case, it seemed that generally speaking, Japanese students tended to have less in-depth conversations than

exchange students in the beginning of a relationship. This relates back to group harmony, *honne/tatemae* and opinions. This may change with time, but even then Japanese student group norms seem to reinforce what the exchange students perceive as shallow or superficial.

One Japanese professor expressed that he himself sometimes had a hard time relating to Japanese university students because of these norms. He explained the Japanese student group norms that he had been observing. One of the strong group norms is *meiwaku o kakenai* (do not make troubles in group activities). Again, the emphasis on group harmony can be seen in this norm. A group achieves this norm by effectively using *honne/tatemae* and not being strong in opinions. Students today are rigid in *hanashi ga au* (fit topics with each other). This norm has implications for the bowling game vs. tennis match style of communication described earlier. The tennis match style, which Westerners are likely to utilize, may make it more difficult for a group to fit the topics together in a harmonious fashion. A third group norm is *tanoshiku hanasu* (talk happily and avoid serious topics). This speaks fairly well for itself and this norm probably contributes to the superficial feeling exchange students get from conversations. One area of talk and interaction which was a huge bridge to the different styles of getting to know one another was the discussion of cultural differences and comparisons of North America and Japan. One of the reasons

for the exchange students to be there was of course for culture learning. They wanted to learn about Japanese culture, and in the process became more aware of their own culture. The exchange students found many Japanese people to be excellent cultural informants. Likewise, many of the Japanese people were very curious about North America and enjoyed these discussions. This was the one area that seemed to satisfy both exchange students and Japanese people in terms of quality of depth of interactions. Ms. Kawaguchi remarked:

> When I'm talking with my Japanese friends I can talk about things that aren't really important without being conscious about it, like, we can have light conversation . . . but when I talk with exchange students, we talk about things based upon cultural differences, so I ask the question expecting very interesting answers because of the cultural differences.

This may say something about Japanese desire to learn about other cultures. Atsuko, who studied abroad in North America remarked:

> Here like with North American students, maybe our friendship is more international friendship . . . or conversation is about cultural difference . . . but in North America they regard me as just a friend, so that's different I think.

Basing the relationship development on cultural differences in the beginning worked well. However, after several months, this framework reached a kind of plateau. In her second interview Jill said "I think a casual like what do you want to know about America and what do I want to know about Japan, a relationship like that can work, but then I don't think it gets past that." North American

students began repeating these cultural difference conversations and it again was the situation of feeling like having the same conversation over and over again. While cultural learning continued, once the learning curve went down, this foundation for relationship building was not as strong.

Invitations was another area of conversation which caused some problems for the North American students in the beginning. The exchange students were perplexed at the invitations they were receiving. There were a lot of "feelers", general invitations, but then no follow-up or more specific invitations to follow. Margaret said "it's always this, let's do it, let's do it, but I don't know if that is for real or not." There were general invitations to become friends, to have meals together, to take a trip somewhere together, to exchange phone numbers and get together some time. It seemed the exchange students were waiting for these general invitations to be followed up with more specific ones. This was frustrating for them, because they found the general invitations were not usually followed up.

This can be viewed using the concept of *honne/tatemae* again. In an earlier quote Hiroshi had expressed that the exchange of phone numbers was a form of *tatemae*. It was a message that the person wanted to know the exchange student but they in fact may not have had intentions of calling the exchange student. When I asked Hiroshi what was going on

with these initial invitations not being followed up, he said:

> I think it happens among Japanese. We say oh let's go out but we don't say any specific time or day. Just sounds nice like actually I want to go out with you but you may be busy and I may be busy so it's just like we wish . . . but I'm still wondering does he or she want to go out with me. I'm not sure so I shouldn't call them. After I found out we are friends, then I'm going to call them . . . but to do something we need a specific reason or motivation.

The gesture of sounding nice is part of this situation. It is a gesture to create harmony. The second factor involved here is that exchange students did not understand the negative implications of rejecting an invitation. Japanese people will maneuver and wait until there is a way to invite someone where they are reasonably sure that the invitee will not say no. There is an element of rejection and/or embarrassment for Japanese people when their invitation is refused. This of course creates a lot of disruption in harmony. If the Japanese person has their invitation refused one time, they are not likely to offer again.

If someone invites you out to a meal, for example, with the express purpose of getting to know that person, then a rejection of the invitation is even more powerful. If one has an agenda for going somewhere together, then even if the invitation is rejected, the rejection won't be taken as personally. Hiroshi mentioned in the previous quote that there needs to be a reason for going out somewhere. This provides some structure to the invitation

interaction. This need for structure is examined further in a following section.

Then there is the time factor also. The exchange student has just arrived and is very eager to get to know people. They come from a culture in which friendships can be formed quite quickly. In addition, they are going to be in Japan for just one year, so they want to get as much out of it as possible as soon as possible. Conversely, Japanese culture develops relationships, including friendships, within a much longer time frame. Hiroshi mentioned that he would wait to see if they were really friends before inviting out somewhere. This time orientation will be examined in more depth in another section. However, it can be seen here that initial interactions were affected by the different time orientations involved in friendship formation in the two cultures.

If someone is invited out and really can not go because of some prior engagement or a conflict in schedule, what then happens? First of all, as mentioned earlier, Japanese people will as much as possible plan an invitation for a time when refusal as a response is minimized. If, however, the invitation can not be accepted, the invitee must come up with some good excuses. Japanese people will sometimes actually pull out an appointment book and show that they already have made an appointment for that time. Or, in order to maintain some harmony, will respond in a

tatemae mode, they will come up with other excuses. It is better to make something up than to have no excuse. Again, the value of harmony over outward honesty is more important.

North American students who did apply the above strategy were more successful in establishing relationships. Also, some exchange students realized that they should be the assertive one in the beginning in terms of making invitations and following up on others' general invitations, and being the first to call. If they had better understood invitations as a form of *tatemae* in the beginning, they could probably have better facilitated joint activities with Japanese students.

Another mode of interaction for the Japanese students to initiate getting to know the exchange students was wanting the exchange students to teach them English. This was sometimes a sincere desire on the part of Japanese people and at other times it provided a good reason to get together. In other words, sometimes it was used more as a form for getting together than for the content of learning English. The exchange students quickly grew frustrated with this initial kind of interaction. They did not want to be viewed as "walking dictionaries", as one exchange student put it. The exchange students also quickly learned how much money they could make teaching English. Many of them did end up teaching English, usually privately. They

then were reluctant to make their business part of their social life.

Another way that Japanese people tried to get to know exchange students was by doing something for them. This mode of initiation seems to be an obvious treatment of the exchange students as guests. When interviewing Japanese people the uses of the prepositions "with" and "for" struck me as significant. Often the Japanese people would want to do something <u>for</u> the exchange students rather than <u>with</u> them. Atsuko compared the treatment of exchange students in Japan with that of exchange students in North America. "We [Japanese] pay more attention to international people and try to communicate with them or treat or take care of them." Again, the language of "treat and take care" is significant. This attitude toward interaction again perpetuated the guest syndrome.

One of the activities which Japanese people liked to do for the exchange students was show them or take them to places in Japan, especially places that not many foreigners have been to. They really enjoyed this and would be disappointed if the exchange students had already done something or been somewhere the Japanese host had planned. Again, this has the feel of treating someone like a guest.

Also, taking a trip together is a fantastic strategy for getting to know someone better. Taking trips is examined more closely in the upcoming section on time orientation.

get to know people." The informal non-structure is reflected in this comment. Jane expressed what she missed in North America. "I long for the North American talk, laugh loudly, you know let's hang out." Jill related to me her experience at a farewell party that some Japanese students held for her and a few other exchange students:

> It's really hard to become good friends with other Japanese students. We're just so different. In so many ways, the way we socialize. . . we get there [at the party] and they are playing like games . . . it was weird, like I didn't want to play games. I just wanted to hang around and talk . . . and you just can't, yea let's just hang out. It always has to be structured and I think that's the biggest problem.

So, this was a barrier in interpersonal relationship development, the North American students wanting to hang out, be informal, while Japanese people looked for the structure, the form that would enable them to attach status to the students in the hierarchy somewhere. The search for structure was a search for status. The perceived status allowed Japanese people to know where the exchange students stood and therefore where they stood with the exchange students.

Definition of Friendship Property

The previous section leads into the next property and a discussion of the definition of friendship and how this affected relationship development. How one defines friendship will determine the expectations one has before trying to establish friendships and also how one will go

about trying to do it. By now it should be clear that the North American students did not generally feel that they successfully established close friendships with Japanese people.

Based on the discussions of the properties of *honne/tatemae* and structure vs. hanging out, it is evident that North American students defined friendship largely by the ability to be able to talk to someone about anything. They really wanted to get into the mindset of Japanese people.

Let me begin with Kenji's definition of friendship, comparing friendships with Japanese friends and friendships with Western friends. He had studied abroad in the States for one year, and spent time with the exchange students at Kwansei Gakuin. "OK so Japanese friends, they're friends with walls-high walls. Then Western friends with really low walls." What is reflected in Kenji's metaphor for me is that the walls represent a structure which must be encroached upon. Inside the walls similar types of friends exist, but the getting through (or over) the high wall is a different process from getting past the low wall.

Overall, the definitions of friendship did not differ so much between Japanese people and the exchange students. Rather, the expectation of the structure in which you establish friendships was somewhat different between Japanese people and exchange students. Reviewing the previous section, it was seen that the exchange students

were more prone to attempt friendship development without feeling the need for a structure. Perhaps just hanging out with people was a way to get to know them well. Becoming familiar with each other's differences is a way to quicken the relationship with someone in a Western context. When one gets to the point of "we have agreed to disagree", the perception is that there is a high level of trust built up.

Japanese people were seen to be striving for structure in which to get to know the students. Japanese people are used to establishing relationships within a tight hierarchy that is formal and status driven. This situation provides the higher walls that Kenji was talking about. The most useful structure in the beginning was the perception that exchange students were guests, and that was a relationship that Japanese people could relate to. As time went on, this guest relationship receded, but never disappeared.

A large part of the Japanese wall structure was the use of *tatemae* and the value of harmony and indirectness that characterized interactions in groups and to an extent in one-on-one interaction. This was sometimes perceived by the exchange students as superficial. Fortunately, the exchange students and Japanese people found a bridge (or a hole in the wall) by being able to discuss cultural differences. Both sides got involved in cultural learning. One can guess that Japanese people did not dispense with *tatemae* in these discussions and still tried to have the interactions result in harmony. I observed both sides

develop ways of talking that were careful in avoiding stereotypes. They were able to discuss culture in generalizable terms which did not cause people to take things personally.

One similarity in defining friendship was that both visiting students and Japanese people included a life-time relationship in their definition of a good friend. This desire could be a positive factor in establishing relationships.

In a previous section, Japanese people were seen to want to do things for exchange students or take care of them in some way. Some of this altruistic looking behavior may have served to keep the exchange students in the guest position. However, among Japanese people, helping someone with a problem was a common component to defining friendship, Remembering back on Alan's experience at the drinking party, after the party his clubmates had said that you have to suffer together as well as have a good time together. The opportunity to be in a situation in which one can help or be helped in a meaningful way then, can be a positive factor in friendship development.

I did not see many opportunities of this sort between exchange students and people. Part of it was that the year at Kwansei Gakuin was relatively stress free. There were not many serious problems cropping up. One of the exchange students from the previous program commented that being at Kwansei Gakuin as an exchange student was like being under

an umbrella. There were not many hard decisions to make and not a lot of difficult tasks to accomplish. Therefore, there were not many problem situations with which Japanese people could help out.

The previously identified notion of life course is relevant here also. If exchange students and Japanese people have different life courses, they are not as likely to be able to relate to the problems the other is having. The encountered problems would have less in common and therefore would be harder to help with.

Even though there was not a big difference in how the two different groups defined friendship, for North American students there was still the element of getting to know someone in a kind of learning mode. They wanted to get to know the other in a "deep" meaningful way. As Jane remarked, "I'm really interested in what their passions are, if they exist." When I asked Margaret what kind of relationships she hoped to establish, she said, "Probably more than anything a learning experience, a chance where you can really develop a cultural understanding." With both Jane and Margaret, and overall with the other exchange students, there was this striving to go into depth. Jane went on to list some of the topics through which she could get to know Japanese students' passions: "situations, morality, politics, whatever issues."

Compare the above to Jane's friend, Michiko, discussing the same subject. I asked Michiko if her

relationship with Jane has progressed and she responded, "we talk about deeper things, like our future dreams, or family background or more everyday topic like most Japanese friends talk about such things." For Michiko, the depth came from more personal parts of life- family, aspirations. But for Jane the deeper part of the relationship rested on more worldly topics. Also interesting in Michiko's comment is that she first mentioned depth with family and life dreams and then goes back again to what the exchange students had found frustrating- everyday topics. It was like Michiko was saying that part of the depth of your relationship is based upon the ability to talk about everyday topics.

The activities which friends participate in together was also seen to differ between Japanese and exchange students. This goes back to hanging out vs. structure. An exchange student party would most likely consist of eating and drinking and perhaps dancing, whereas a Japanese student-hosted party would probably involve games or some other kind of structure. Kenji, who spent a lot of time socializing with the exchange students, put this into comparative perspective:

> I notice that it's more fun to share any conversation with, not particularly those guys in exchanges but anyone who is a foreigner, yea better than Japanese guys . . . Either we have to go to *karaoke* or we have to bring some girls or you know you have to do something to have fun with Japanese guys . . . Sometimes it's fun to do something, but kind of sad that you have to do something to have fun all the time.

Kenji enjoyed socializing with foreigners more because of the lack of need for some kind of structure. He felt the conversations were better.

Time-Orientation Property

Overall, it would seem that the definition of a friend for North Americans would be that a friendship has a kind of quality of depth to it that they just did not find in Japan. Japanese friendships also have a quality of depth, but the expression of depth and especially the time frame differ. The next property to be examined is time - orientation. The definition of what constitutes a good friend was not so different between the two cultures, but the time frame was. This may be the single most important barrier to establishing close relationships between the exchange students and their people.

Exchange students, for the most part, did not recognize the one year time frame of their stay as a barrier in establishing friendships. North Americans are more accustomed to developing friendships within a short time. It would not be uncommon for a North American to meet someone over a week-end gathering at a mutual friend's house and then soon thereafter be spending a lot of time together. However, the Japanese people whom I interviewed were quite conscious of this short time factor. It emerged in the discussion of initial interactions, where exchange students were ready to accept invitations, but were

perplexed when these were not followed up in a short time. It was also pointed out that for some exchange students, it was too difficult to spend long periods of time together with Japanese friends and contribute to the group harmony using *tatemae*.

Mr. Suzuki, Sean's friend, expressed the need to know someone over a period of time:

> That means if you don't have much time to spend with a person, you can't see much of the person [means you can't get to know them well?] yes, or it means you can't get to know a lot in different aspects of the person if you don't have a lot of time to spend with them. If you spend a lot of time with that person you can talk about something deep.

Whereas the North American exchange students were more likely to talk about something deep based upon a desire to get to know the other and through hanging out together, the evolution of deeper relationships for Japanese people comes through numbers of shared activities over time. When I asked Nami how trust builds up between Japanese people, she replied "just time." When I asked Kenji how Japanese people get to the point of expressing opinions and being more open with each other, he replied, "I think time normally solves the thing."

Duration of time and numbers of activities create depth of relationship for Japanese people. While this is of course true with Westerners as well, Westerners can go the other way and develop relationships more quickly also. A key component of time and multiple shared activities is memories. Good memories are very important in Japanese

culture. This is reflected in the extensive use of video and photos during activities. It also came through in this study, that Japanese people would like to have good shared memories with the visiting exchange students.

One common activity that takes time and is useful for creating good memories, and therefore for friendship building, is taking long trips together. Many of the Japanese students who I interviewed suggested taking trips together with exchange students was one thing they hoped to do in order to become better friends. Keiko said:

> I'd like to have more deeper kind of relationship and I'd like that different point of view from them so if possible I'd like to have a small trip with them [exchange students] to near here in Japan. I think trip really makes, how to say, relaxed and we have much time to talk, like all night, so if possible, I'd like to have a trip together with them.

When I asked Ms. Kawaguchi why she would want to travel together with an exchange student she replied, "when you travel the person has to be really close to you." Perhaps the trip is a way to have a non-structured structure. What I mean is that it is a "reason" to do something together, but it is an activity which is nonstructured. Perhaps then status is not as important and people can be relaxed, as Ms. Kawaguchi stated above. In addition, it is a way of getting to know someone on a variety of levels. Ultimately, it will create a good memory.

A Japanese faculty member related his own experience in moving from another area of Japan to work at Kwansei

Gakuin. He had been working at a university in another area of Japan and then moved to Nishinomiya to work at Kwansei Gakuin. In the account he mentions the "Kansai" area. This is the area surrounding Osaka. His experience had direct parallels with the exchange students' experience in terms of depth of quality of interactions over a time period. It is revealed in this account how long it took for him to gain some kind of acceptance into his group, and he is Japanese!

> As you know, I came from ... and was not accustomed to the Kansai culture. Kansai culture is more homogeneous than Kanto [Tokyo area] culture and Kansai-jin [people of Kansai area] tend to dislike people who do not speak the Kansai dialect. Of course many aspects of the way of conducting and feeling in everyday life are deeply different from Kanto. So my problem was somewhat similar to a foreigner's one. My way of thinking and conducting were very different from Kansai-jin, but they had to take me into their group as member. How did they do that? In the first year after I came here, staff members were not willing to speak to me because they were not accustomed to interact with Kanto-jin. It was difficult for them to have a talk with me naturally. The strategy they used was to make conversation with me in formal situation such as meeting. In such situations, they could easily try to say, "would you have some opinions?" to me. Of course, such talk was ritual and they really didn't need my comments. But I had to say something, so I made a reply that would cause no trouble. In such meetings, not only my replies but various expressions of my face and body language were observed and understood. So, it was such formally accomplished situations that they tried to observe and realize who I am and how I think and feel, avoiding doing so directly. After many opportunities like those, gradually they were confident how to speak to me, and it was not until they were sure I would not refuse that they said, "why don't you come and have a dinner with us?" after a meeting. "After a meeting" was a very important chance both for them to say so and

> for me to accept their invitation naturally. To have a dinner after a meeting often means to go to drink. To drink together is a very important strategy to accept and learn each other for Japanese. In such situations even direct expressions of their feelings and opinions are almost always allowed. And to be invited to drink together after such a long latent process of observation often means to be recognized as a member. Only after such natural process, Japanese are able to accept differences and learn from each other. In my case, it took almost two years to be seen as a member in such sense. For Japanese, the deep relationship has various aspects and verbal communication is only one of them. It may relate to the fact that Japanese often value the empathy and conformity, rather than the rationality. In other words, Japanese always try to accept differences and learn from each other without disturbing their mutual feelings of similarity.

In this account the issue of invitations was mentioned. Also, the use of opinion seeking as ritual was included. Drinking also came into this passage. What was most important in this passage was the description of the "latent and gradual" process of accepting and learning about each other. The greater value on empathy and conformity as opposed to rationality takes a greater amount of time to act out. The group was getting to know the new faculty member, but the gradual process was long.

This presents a fundamental obstacle in a one-year exchange program like the one at Kwansei Gakuin University. There are two levels to this. On the one level, Japanese people have constraints in that they have to try and interact with visiting students, knowing they are there for just one year. This is a different temporal frame for them. On the second level is the decision for the exchange

students in terms of adaptation and assimilation. As the year went on, they were becoming increasingly aware of the behaviors necessary to adapt to Japanese cultural values and customs. For the most part, they chose not to adapt to these things in a deep way. They made the judgment that it just was not worth sacrificing their enjoyment with the other exchange students and their deeply-held values in order to adapt to the Japanese value-directed behaviors. The costs in terms of their enjoyment of the school year would have outweighed any benefits gained from adapting to the gradual and latent process of fitting into the Japanese culture surrounding them. Along with this is the realization that about the time things become more involved, perhaps after one year, they would be returning to their own country.

This all seems to say something in favor of the exchange students maintaining their guest identity. If one decides to maintain their own basic Western values which are informal, egalitarian, direct, and individualistic, then it is probably best to not try and cross over from the guest status into the Japanese hierarchy.

Summary of Friendship Category

The four properties comprising the friendship category are initial interactions, structure vs. hanging out, definition of friendship, and time orientation.

The exchange students did not fully understand the nature of initial interactions. They sometimes misinterpreted their people' initial attempts at getting to know them. One reason for the different perceptions between people and exchange students was the people's striving for some kind of structure in which to establish the relationship, while the exchange students were still operating in their informal North American mode, wanting to hang out. The definition of a friend was not so different between exchange students and Japanese people. However, the time orientation for making close friends was quite different. The Japanese time frame is much longer than the North American one. This also reinforces the need for good initial interactions, so that the relationship development period is not stalled.

Discussion of Hierarchy and Friendship: Contrast in Cultural Values

High and Low Contexts

Human behavior is largely driven by cultural values. The interactions between visiting North American exchange students and Japanese people were affected by cross-cultural value differences. Value differences have been implicit in the previous part of this chapter. The following is an explicit look at the contrast in cultural values between the North American students and their Japanese people.

The North American students came from a culture and upbringing which rests upon a strong value placed on egalitarianism. Egalitarianism is supported by values of individuality, directness/honesty, informality, and earned status. Problems arose when students attempted to fit into a cultural milieu which is based upon a hierarchy. A hierarchical structure is supported by the values of group identity, indirectness/maintaining harmony, formality, and ascribed status.

Edward Hall (1976, pp. 85-128) was instrumental in organizing the above value-orientations into an interrelated scheme. In this scheme, cultures are looked at from two opposing ends of a continuum. "High-context" cultures possess the value-orientations found in Japan, while "low-context" cultures possess the value-orientations found in North America. High-context cultures can be referred to as "collective" cultures and low-context cultures can be called "individualist" cultures. In this study, the values of hierarchy (high-context) and egalitarianism (low-context) were more germane than collectivist and individualist.

In high-context cultures very little information is explicit. Meaning in communication is pre-programmed and cues for behavior are devoid of ambiguity. A person's identity is established through their in-group (family, friends, co-workers, classmates) relationships. The in-group is at the center of one's life and it is difficult to

change from one in-group to another. Status differences are accepted and ascribed (based upon age, profession, lineage, family relationship). Since the norms for behavior are clear and consistent, communication is indirect. Where someone fits into the hierarchy determines how one will interact with the person. So, when high-context cultures' people are in social interaction situations, the context of the situation will determine their actions. If a Japanese person interacts with their boss, they know exactly what to say, and when and how to say it.

Using the same example, when boss and subordinate interact in a low-context culture, the nature of their interaction will not be clear from the beginning. It will depend upon individual variations. Information in a low-context culture needs to be explicit so that the actors in a situation understand how to interact. The subordinate will not know for sure how the boss wants to be addressed until explicitly told by the boss. They might be on a first name basis, or they might be on a very formal basis. In low-context cultures, individuals have many in-groups and can move into and out of them quite easily. Low-context cultures value egalitarianism and believe status is earned by good works or exhibiting good qualities.

An understanding of cultural value contrasts can aid sojourners and people in avoiding stereotyping. In order to carry out effective cross-cultural interaction, an

important assumption is that all people are individuals. However, in order to make some kind of sense of cross-cultural interaction, generalizing about cultural values is necessary. Another assumption is that cultural values exist on a continuum that is not static. The values which are contrasted here should be thought of as on a continuum. I am not attempting to say that all Japanese people are totally formal and all North Americans totally informal. I am saying that, in general, Japanese people interact in a fashion which is more formal than North American people. Japanese culture is at the higher end of the context scale, while North American culture is at the lower end. The cultural value continuum which was most relevant for the participants' experience in this study follows:

Japanese Culture <----continuum---->	North American Culture
Hierarchical structure ----------	Egalitarian structure
Group identity ----------	Individualism
Ascribed status ----------	Earned status
Indirectness/maintain harmony ------	Directness/honesty
Formality ----------	Informality

Hierarchy and Egalitarianism

In Japan, one's status in a hierarchy is ascribed and explicit. This determines how one fits in. It is important to fit in, no matter how. Foreigners in Japan have no readily recognized status in the hierarchy, except as guests. The North American students wanted to just fit in. Because of the hierarchical structure in Japan, visiting students found themselves identified as guests.

In Japan, guests are treated as special. Being treated as a guest was not the North American students' idea of fitting in. Because of their egalitarian value, North American students wanted to be treated as individuals, and be accepted into the hierarchy based upon their individual traits and abilities. This difference in value-orientation caused some frustration for the exchange students.

Formality and Informality

In a North American cultural context, being treated as a guest is not generally positive or comfortable. Indeed, one of the most desirable phrases for a houseguest in North America is "make yourself at home." Visitors to North America are often disoriented by the way that their people seem to not treat them as guests. The treatment is more informal in North America, as that is what will make a North American feel more "at home." There is more of a formal relationship in being treated as a guest in Japan. Part of being a guest is the formal treatment. Where status and roles are ascribed, formalities are more observed. For example, language greetings and rituals in departures are more formal because everyone quickly understands everyone else's status within the hierarchy.

In North America, interactions are more ambiguous, especially in relatively new relationships, as the status is not entirely clear. People earn their status through individual behavior and traits that are exhibited. Because

of this ambiguity, interactions are more informal. The informality allows for more flexibility in terms of status being more clearly defined as individuals "earn" their status.

The contrast between formality and informality was manifested in exchange students' desire to hang out versus the Japanese people' need for structure in interactions. Larry tried to break down the hierarchy in the club he joined by being more light and informal with the team captain and other members. He identified the formality which exists in a hierarchy as negative.

Ascribed Status and Earned Status

In a hierarchy, one's place is only in relation to one's status in the group. Status is ascribed, or granted based upon pre-conceived criteria. In Japan, this criteria is based upon age, family relationship, gender, work position and place, and educational background. In an egalitarian structure, status is earned. Generally, one's personality, individual traits and qualities, and contributions to the group determine one's status. This gives equal opportunity to anyone to become a leader, a follower, or take on any role they would like to try. North American students were frustrated when they were treated as a guest, no matter what their individual traits and actions were.

Iwata (1979, p. 23) discussed the importance of two aspects of status in Japanese culture: (1) the social prestige of the group to which one belongs (the "in-group"); and (2) the level of status one has attained within one's group. Kwansei Gakuin University served as a broad-based in-group for its students. Universities in Japan exist on a very hierarchical level in terms of prestige. Kwansei Gakuin has fairly high prestige. Status within the in-group is usually ascribed.

Ascribed status was manifested in the clubs. North Americans were frustrated with the ascribed status of women. Women were perceived as possessing low status in the hierarchy of coed clubs. Some clubs prohibited women from joining. The *sempai/kohai* relationship also demonstrated ascribed status. Being a *sempai* is based upon age. North American students had a difficult time in both roles. It was difficult for some to take on the menial tasks assigned to a *kohai*. Some could not act the part of a *sempai*. The behavior towards a *kohai* required of a *sempai* was sometimes too difficult for North American students. Coming from an egalitarian structure, the behavior required sometimes appeared too crass or undemocratic.

Individualism and Group Identity

In a hierarchical structure like Japan's, one's self-identity is first a function of one's relationship to the

group of which he/she is a part. The individual exists for the group. In the more relatively egalitarian culture of North America, it can be said that the group exists for the individual. North Americans believe that the individual's needs must be met before the particular individual can become part of and contribute to a particular group. In Japan, individual needs are subordinated to the group's needs. From the beginning, Japanese people attempted to relate to the exchange students based upon their status in the Japanese hierarchy. This status was first as a guest. Japanese people needed to see exchange students somewhere in the hierarchy and then could get to know them as individuals. For the individualistic North Americans, being recognized as an individual would be necessary before one could be placed in a certain status in a group. This difference in values resulted in frustration for the exchange students.

The use of *honne/tatemae* contributes to group identity and harmony. Communicating this way requires one to subordinate their individuality in order to fit in with the group. The North American students did not understand *honne/tatemae* in the beginning of their stay. One manifestation of the diffculty created was their discussion style of stating opinions when Japanese people were more prone to talk about personal matters and small talk which did not require opinions. Stating opinions is a very individualistic behavior.

Directness/Honesty and Indirectness/Maintaining Harmony

This value-orientation dichotomy is related to *honne/tatemae*. When *honne/tatemae* is implicitly understood by people interacting with one another, then the indirect *tatemae* mode of communicating is still understood. The exchange students did not understand the contexts in which they were interacting. Accustomed to more explicit cues when interacting, they could not pick up on the indirect messages.

Because relationships are long-term in Japan, there is a high value placed upon harmonious relations. Iwata (1979) claims that this kind of harmony is essential to the life-time employment system which exists in Japan. He relates that the kind of relationships necessary in the employment world are formed in university life in Japan.

In the discussion of high/low context culture it was recognized that in a high context culture like Japan's, the implicit cues for behavior are more understood. With a high degree of formality, clear status roles, and group identity, Japanese people understand how they are supposed to act in certain kinds of situations. Therefore, communication does not need to be as direct. Additionally, indirect communication is more useful for maintaining harmony. This maintaining of harmony is important in a culture where group identity is more important than individualism.

Conversely, low context cultures like those in North America require more direct and explicit means of communication. The cues for behavior are usually ambiguous and have to be learned all the time. This is because status of group members is not readily apparent until after some time of interacting together. Direct communication styles lend themselves to the expression of honesty. Honesty is important in an individualistic culture. Individualism assumes that people should express their differing opinions and views, so that everyone can get to know each other in a deeper way. Once people are known to each other, they can start to function as a group, with each member playing a role in the group based upon their individual traits and abilities. Watanabe (1990) found similar dynamics in group discussion situations that involved Japanese and American people. While the North American students at Kwansei Gakuin often felt they could get to know others through opinion expression, Japanese students more often felt they could get to know others by talking about their personal lives.

Summary-Answers to Research Questions

The primary research question that guided this study was, "what social-psychological factors contribute to, or inhibit, positive interpersonal relationship development between Japanese and North American students at Kwansei Gakuin University?". There were four broad implementing

research questions which guided the interview questions for participants in the study. The research questions were originally formulated based upon the literature review that was done prior to the research design. These questions were identified in chapters one and three. These questions have been answered throughout this chapter, basically organized around the two categories of hierarchy and friendship, along with their respective properties.

This chapter summary is a synopsis of the answer to the primary research question identified above. The summary is presented using the two categories and their properties as structure. The categories and properties concepts were a way to organize the variables and demonstrate their interrelationship. The categories and properties can be thought of as the research variables that emerged. The interrelationship of these variables describes and explains the study participants' experience. This interrelationship is presented through the tentative hypotheses. Tentative hypotheses are presented as the first paragraph of each property summary. The demonstrations of the inter-relationship between the categories and their properties results in a somewhat holistic explanation which answers the primary research question.

Hierarchy Category-Guest Syndrome Property

Hypothesis: Since the exchange students came from a relatively egalitarian culture, some of them reacted

negatively to the hierarchical social structure which exists in Japan. The social hierarchy which exists in Japan places strangers, especially foreigners, as honored guests. Exchange students' overall experience could be looked at as a search for their place in the hierarchy. In the beginning of their stay, this guest treatment was very comfortable and aided their transition to Japanese culture. Their informal and egalitarian values made them frustrated when they were continually treated as guests. Because of cultural differences in value-orientations, exchange students had difficulty emerging from the guest role and generally did not establish deep relationships with Japanese people.

Within the Japanese hierarchical structure, where foreigners do not have an assigned place, making them guests seems to be a tangible level on which they have some guidance on how to treat foreigners. The continual treatment of being treated like a guest, keeping one outside the inner Japanese hierarchy, was a barrier to the North American students joining the hierarchy and finding some status other than as guests, and hence was a barrier to the kind of relationship development that they wanted.

In the experience of the North American students, they found that the very beginning of the stay was positive because of this guest treatment and hospitality. It meant there were no major pressures on them and they had a fairly good transition into Japan. However, as time went on, they

came to see this guest treatment as a major obstacle to their motivation for trying to establish relationships. They all came to understand the guest dynamic and, as a group, it generally caused them to cease trying to establish close relationships. They became more resigned to the fact that they would not establish close relationships. Some felt frustrated, and some took it more in stride and accepted it.

Hierarchy Category--*Honne/Tatemae* Property

Hypothesis: The lack of understanding of the *honne/tatemae* concept and communication style, especially in the beginning of their stay, hindered exchange students' ability to develop relationships. *Honne/Tatemae* functions to reinforce group cohesiveness and maintain harmonious relations. Because of their individualistic values, the exchange students had a hard time adapting to *honne/tatemae*. A manifestation of this was their desire to voice individual opinions as a way to get to know people. They became frustrated with Japanese people's reluctance to voice opinions. When exchange students did not demonstrate *honne/tatemae* behavior, it reinforced their guest status in the Japanese hierarchy.

The *tatemae* mode of communication is one way to make yourself part of a group, and to help find your status in the group and the group's hierarchy. When you are together with a group in Japan, you cover your own feelings and

beliefs if it is going to detract from harmony in the group. One of the reasons North American students can perceive it negatively is because it seems like it isn't honest, it's a "veneer". This is not positive to most North Americans. Another aspect of *tatemae* is that if it contributes to the group harmony, this very often subdues individualistic behavior, which can provide difficulties for North Americans.

The property of *honne/tatemae* then is quite linked with the guest syndrome in the hierarchy category. Having status in any kind of hierarchy in Japan means belonging to a group. In order to belong to a group, one must be able to act according to the value of group identity and limit individualistic behavior, such as voicing strong opinions. One must be able to act in a way that will maintain group harmony. A large part of this behavior is being able to use *honne/tatemae*. Using *tatemae* on the part of Japanese people served to keep exchange students outside the hierarchy. Complementarily, exchange students not using *honne/tatemae* perpetuates their image as a guest and served to create barriers to being in the hierarchy. It was seen that initial interactions such as invitations, conversations, and activities, were often a form of *tatemae* and treatment of exchange students as guests.

Hierarchy Category-Student Identity Property

Hypothesis: Exchange students found the university intellectually and academically disappointing. Because of this, they did not have the intellectual aspect of student identity to latch onto. Intellectual and academic pursuits were not something they had in common with Japanese students or professors. This caused a barrier in relationship development. The second half of the year, in which the exchange students participated in regular Japanese classes, was an aiding factor in their relationship development. It placed them in the hierarchy closer to their Japanese host students - away from the guest status. Even though the exchange students did not have academic pursuits in common with Japanese students, they did engage in extensive discussions about Japanese and North American cultures. This was an aiding factor in relationship development and helped to compensate for the lack of academic and intellectual stimulation.

The form of participation in Japanese classes may look more like a form of non-participation to a foreigner. But if examined a little further, the forms of interaction in Japanese classrooms are intended to perpetuate the hierarchy which exists. It may even be considered a form of *tatemae*, in that students do not express opinions and the main foundation to the classes is again maintaining harmony.

The academic and intellectual disappointment on the part of the North American students took away one avenue for pursuing where they fit in at the university and in Japan in general. In a North American university intellectual and academic growth is one tangible area for building identity and esteem. If this outlet does not exist, then there needs to be something to compensate. The implication here is that students need to focus more on language and cultural learning, as well as interpersonal relationship development. Their language and cultural learning can be enhanced by developing and maintaining good interpersonal relationships with people.

Hierarchy Category-Gender Property

Hypothesis: North American women experienced additional barriers to fitting into the hierarchy. Coming from North America, it was difficult for them to join clubs and other activities where women are still at the bottom of the hierarchy in today's university in Japan.

Hierarchy Category-Alcohol Use Property

Hypothesis: The use of alcohol can be a key ritual in both the breaking down of hierarchy and including people in it.

Related to the gender property, this is not a viable option for women, as drinking a lot in public is not so acceptable for women. For men, being invited to drink was a

significant step in relationship development. Open expression of feelings is acceptable when drinking.

Hierarchy Category-Strategies Property

Hypothesis: There were three basic strategies employed by the exchange students to try and deal with the hierarchy in Japan. One successful strategy was to first recognize and accept the cultural differences and that the first and foremost identity of an exchange student is that of a foreigner. Once this framework is established, the exchange student can do whatever is possible to adapt to Japanese customs and behavior. Trying to change the existing structure is another strategy that was employed. A third strategy was to gravitate toward the exchange student group as the primary identity group. This fulfilled social and intellectual needs.

Most of the North American students' backgrounds gave them an identity that includes values of egalitarianism, individuality, informality, and earned status. The dilemma was how to maintain this but still fit into a hierarchy, a hierarchy which rests on the values of group identity, maintaining harmony, prescribed status, and formality.

It was shown that the North American students found barriers to forming interpersonal relationships because they could not fit totally into the hierarchy, unless they were content with their position as a guest. One successful strategy was to adjust expectations and

understand that your first identity in Japan is that of a foreigner, and then to adapt to Japanese values and customs as much as possible within that framework. A second strategy was to try and change the Japanese structure. A third strategy was to spend time with the exchange student group (pack mentality) in order to get affiliation needs met.

Friendship Category-Initial Interactions Property

Hypothesis: Since the exchange students participate in a one-year program, their initial interactions are very important for getting the relationship process started in this relatively short time period. The exchange students at KGU had a hard time figuring out interactions in the beginning and this retarded their relationship development. They didn't realize the *tatemae* nature of initial interactions. This caused them to misunderstand some of the meaning of initial interactions with people.

The exchange students' perception of shallowness in relationships with Japanese people was due in large part to the perceived shallowness of conversations. Japanese people also expressed at times that they would like to have more in-depth conversations. While this was sometimes the case, it seemed that, generally speaking, Japanese students tended to have less in-depth conversations than exchange students in the beginning of a relationship. This relates back to group harmony, *honne/tatemae* and opinions. This

may change with time, but even then Japanese student group norms seem to reinforce what the exchange students perceive as shallow or superficial.

So, it should come as no surprise that the initial conversations and interactions between exchange students and Japanese people were basically that of exchange students being guests. Being a guest was a tangible place in the hierarchy. Initial and ensuing interactions had the feel of trying to find a structure for the interaction, a form for the interaction, that could then help Japanese people to view exchange students somewhere in their hierarchy.

Friendship Category-Structure vs. Hanging Out Property

Hypothesis: Because of the North American values of egalitarianism, individuality, and informality, the exchange students did not recognize the need for Japanese people to have some kind of structure involved in joint activities. Since the exchange students did not have a definitive place in the hierarchy, Japanese people tried to find very structured forms in which to interact. This is typical in a high context culture like Japan's. Some of the best relationships students had were the ones they established with their English students. The teacher-student relationship is very structured and clear. This need for structure contrasted with the exchange students wanting to be more informal and hang out.

Whereas the striving for structure was a part of the Japanese perspective, a common perspective for exchange students was the desire to "hang out." This relates to the value of informality which exists in North America. This value is very strong with university aged North Americans. It has been brought out throughout this chapter that the North American students sometimes reacted negatively to the formality which exists in Japan. This formality is seen as an integral part of creating and perpetuating a hierarchical society in which relationships are prescribed. In the earlier discussion of hierarchy, Larry was seen to not like the formality of the hierarchy and a component of his strategy in dealing with the hierarchy was to break it down by being more informal.

So, this was a barrier in interpersonal relationship development, the North American students wanting to hang out, be informal, while Japanese people looked for the structure, the form that would enable them to attach status to the students in the hierarchy somewhere. The search for structure was a search for status. The perceived status allowed Japanese people to know where the exchange students stood and therefore where they stood with the exchange students.

Friendship Category-Definition of Friendship

Hypothesis: The definition of a friend was not so different between Japanese people and North American

exchange students. For example, a lifetime relationship and someone who can help with problems were in both groups' definitions. However, the context for friendship development differed between the two cultures. The primary difference in context is the length of time involved to develop the relationship. There is a much longer time frame involved in Japan.

In the section on the category of hierarchy, it was seen that a lot of the interpersonal relationship experience for exchange students was trying to figure out where they fit in, and how they would go about fitting in. If one is primarily outside the hierarchy and largely perceived as a guest by Japanese people, this also provides obstacles in the formation of friendship. Indeed, in the analysis and interpretation of friendship formation, it was seen that the question of where the students fit in the group hierarchy caused some hindrances in the development of friendships. Conversely, the differences between the North American and Japanese students also at times provided a ready-made common ground with which they could get to know each other. North American students were there to learn about Japanese people and culture and the Japanese people who they got to know were curious and interested to know about foreigners also.

Overall, the North American students did develop some friendships during their stay at Kwansei Gakuin. In varying degrees they did become involved with Japanese

friends and participated in a variety of social activities with them. They found Japanese people to be good people and enjoyed learning about Japanese culture. However, in the strictly interpersonal area, the North American students' initial expectations regarding friendship development by and large were not met. As briefly described in the overview of relationship development, in the minds of the exchange students, there were not any deep friendships developed.

Friendship Category-Time Orientation Property

Hypothesis: Relationships in Japan develop gradually over a long period of time. The relatively short time of one year caused an obstacle in developing friendships for the exchange students.

Finally, the time orientation property is interrelated with the other properties. This presents a fundamental obstacle in a one-year exchange program like the one at Kwansei Gakuin University. There are two levels to this. On the one level Japanese people have constraints in that they have to try and interact with visiting students, knowing they are there for just one year. This is a different temporal frame for them. On the second level is the decision for the exchange students in terms of adaptation and assimilation. As the year went on, they were becoming increasingly aware of the behaviors necessary to adapt to Japanese cultural values and customs. For the

most part, they chose not to adapt to these things in a deep way. They made the judgment that it just was not worth sacrificing their enjoyment with the other exchange students and their deeply-held values in order to adapt to the Japanese value-directed behaviors. They could not see a good reason to do this. The costs in terms of their enjoyment of the school year would have outweighed any benefits gained from adapting to the gradual and latent process of fitting into the Japanese culture surrounding them. Along with this is the realization that about the time things become more involved, perhaps after one year, they would be returning to their own country.

Summary Implication

The broad implication of the tentative hypotheses stated above is that if good interpersonal relationship development is a goal in study abroad programs in Japan, then pre-departure orientation is necessary for increasing the North American students' understanding of Japanese values, before arriving. This could serve to "jump start" the relationship building in a place where relationships are built very gradually. An orientation program can be developed from a synthesis of this study's findings and these findings' relation to cross-cultural concepts such as values, high context/low context culture, and cross-cultural training and orientation.

CHAPTER 5

RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This recommendations chapter addresses some possible strategies for overcoming the barriers and emphasizing the helping factors which contributed to effective interpersonal relationship development identified in the previous chapter. The recommendations suggested are derived from the overall thesis of this paper; if effective interpersonal relationships are to develop in a one-year exchange program between Japanese hosts and North American students at a Japanese university, the process must be "jump started", or accelerated even before the North American students leave. There is an assumption that it is incumbent upon the visiting North American students to adapt their behavior. The jump start process can begin with North American study abroad administrators providing cross-cultural orientation and advising the North American students so as to increase their knowledge of the processes at work in interpersonal relationship development. The process can continue during the study abroad program in Japan, with Japanese foreign student administrators making some interventions to accelerate and foster interpersonal relationship development.

A significant component of cross-cultural orientation and education should be values clarification. The value-

orientation differences which emerged as significant for the participants in this study were identified and analyzed in the previous chapter. A basic understanding of the cultural value contrasts between Japan and North America identified in the previous chapter would aid exchange students in interpreting their interaction experiences in Japan. This kind of understanding contributes to depersonalization of the experience. Depersonalization leads to reserving of judgment. Reserving judgment is a key aspect of successful cross-cultural interpersonal relationship development.

An understanding of the concepts presented in this dissertation could aid new exchange students in developing interpersonal relationships. Understanding the value-orientation differences between North American and Japanese culture can contribute to North American students' ability to assess their experiences within the context of hierarchy and the nature of relationship and friendship development in Japan. The previous chapter's section on value interrelationships is important to understand and can be addressed in cross-cultural orientations and advising by both North American and Japanese administrators.

This chapter then is organized by the same categories and properties that were utilized in the previous chapter. The barriers and aids to interpersonal relationship development that occurred within these categories are repeated and then corresponding recommendations are stated.

Some recommendations are for North American study abroad students and some are for study abroad/foreign student administrators, both in North America and in Japan.

This dissertation does not suggest a specific design for cross-cultural orientation or techniques of advising. It does suggest the content which can be addressed in these two interventions. It outlines the kind of understanding that could help North American students in establishing more effective interpersonal relations.

After the recommendations for students and administrators, there is a section on recommendations for researchers.

Recommendations for Students and Study Abroad Administrators

Hierarchy-Guest Syndrome

The experience of the North American students at Kwansei Gakuin was a quest of trying to fit in somewhere. In a hierarchical and status-based culture such as Japan's, the quest of an outside foreigner trying to fit in presented some problems. The natural status for foreign students, at least in the beginning, was that of a guest. While being treated as a guest in the beginning was perceived as positive by the North American students, they were frustrated later when the guest treatment continued.

Recommendations for visiting North American students include:

1. An overall adjustment in expectations is required. Visitors must realize that in the eyes of Japanese people, they will always first and foremost be seen as foreigners. The desire to fit in as just yourself or as an individual should probably be squelched. Japanese people will not see you as an individual, but as a part of the foreigner group. People are seen first as a member of a particular group in Japan, not as an individual. Once one understands his/her identity as a foreigner, it is then easier to get on with establishing effective relationships within these parameters. If one can accept the gracious treatment of being treated as a guest, then it will be easier to find the opportunities for moving beyond this, if desired. Acting as guest can be the first step to fitting into the hierarchy, and then evolving it as time goes on. Rather than trying to interact on a familiar level early on in the stay, one can reciprocate as a guest would.

One way to do this is to early on make it clear that selected Japanese hosts have an open invitation to visit you in North America, where Japanese people could then be given the same guest treatment. Another effective gesture is sending thank you notes to people after they have treated you to some activity. If you take any photos, making prints for all the people in the photo will be an effective way to thank someone for the activity. This

gesture is done between good friends as well as people involved in the guest/host relationship.

Language plays a large role in whether or not someone is treated as a guest or not. In the initial stages of being treated as a guest, it is important to use polite language that guests use. Once one successfully demonstrates their ability, partly through language use, to act as a guest, then the relationship can continue to evolve. Similarly, if one chooses to move beyond the guest/host relationship, then the language use must also reflect this.

One's language use must reflect one's status in a particular group. This requires an understanding of the value orientation of ascribed status. North Americans are more accustomed to a value orientation of earned status, where one is treated according to merit, abilities, and individual traits. In a culture where one's identity rests within a group structure, status tends to be more ascribed. It is based upon more constant, concrete factors such as age, profession, and class level at school. If one is an upperclassman in a Japanese university, talk directed toward lower class level people should not be formal. For the North American, this use of language may seem almost rude. But for the Japanese person, the language use will put them at ease and be a familiar cue for relationship development. Until one can use the language that fits in

the status roles within a relationship, it will be difficult to move out of the guest/host relationship.

One specific example of this language use is in the homestay situation. It helps the North American student to move beyond being a guest if he/she addresses their host parents with the Japanese words for mother and father- *Okaasan* and *Otoosan* respectively. In the university club setting, the *sempai/kohai* relationship was identified as one in which the proper use of language to reflect status roles was found to be important.

Recommendations for foreign student administrators in Japan:

1. Host family orientations in which the families and the visiting North American students discuss expectations can be an effective way to clarify this guest treatment notion. It is a time when students can express their desire, if they wish, to not be treated as guests. The host families can then explain what they would expect from the host students in this situation.
2. Buchanan and Cantril (1953) expressed the need for some kind of meaningful joint work to be undertaken by hosts and visitors in order to better establish interpersonal relationships. Japanese study abroad administrators may want to formulate some kind of programmatic activities which would contribute to some

meaningful work together. This could help to bring the relationship beyond the guest/host level.

Hierarchy-*Honne/Tatemae*

Not understanding the dynamics of *honne/tatemae* contributes to breakdowns in communication and misunderstanding, thus hindering interpersonal relationship development. In Japan, the *honne/tatemae* modes of communication are taken for granted. Understanding *honne/tatemae* is the first step in dealing with it. This dynamic was analyzed in the preceding chapter.

Recommendations for North American students:

1. Understanding the nature of *honne/tatemae* and one's own attitude toward it is the first step toward effectively using these modes of interaction. Relating to the guest syndrome, effective use of *honne/tatemae* is seen as essential to moving out of one's position as an honored guest. Being able to use *honne/tatemae* contributes to one finding a place in the hierarchy and moving beyond guest status. Maintaining harmony is the end result of using *honne/tatemae*. It is a sign of maturity to be able to interact with appropriate use of *honne/tatemae*.
2. Looking friendly is very important. An aspect of this is the appearance and face that one presents. A friendly appearance must be able to be read by the person with whom one is interacting.

3. One should avoid direct expressions of disagreement and personal opinions. Direct expression of personal opinions can be seen as a sign of immaturity.
4. One should learn the effective use of polite and honorific forms of language. For example, the use of *shitsurei shimasu* (I am being rude) when arriving late in a group or departing earlier than other group members can help maintain harmony.

Study abroad administrators in the U.S. and foreign student administrators in Japan should include education regarding *honne/tatemae* in cross-cultural orientation programs. Recommendations listed under other properties are also related to *honne/tatemae*. Interactions using *honne/tatemae* are a part of all relationships in Japan.

Hierarchy-Student Identity

The identity of university students in Japan and the U.S. differs. Whereas many North American students see their academic and intellectual development as an important part of their university life, Japanese university life focuses more on social relationships in life. The lack of academic and intellectual stimulation was a source of frustration to the North American students at Kwansei Gakuin.

Recommendations for visiting North American students:

1. If one is participating in a program similar to Kwansei Gakuin's, an adjustment in expectations is

required. Expect a low degree of academic and intellectual stimulation. The primary reason for participating in this kind of program should be language and culture learning. If one is primarily interested in academic stimulation, then a program that utilizes a North American curriculum and instructors would be more desirable. However, the cultural and language learning would then suffer.

2. Independent and small group study with other North American students can be undertaken to compensate in the academic area.
3. Join clubs in order to fit in better to the social structure at the university. When joining a club, adapt as much as possible to the structure and norms of the club. Pay attention to the *kohai/sempai* relationship and act according to your role as a *kohai* or *sempai*.
4. If possible, get to know Japanese professors in situations outside class, such as coffee shop talks or dinners together.
5. Effectively use *honne/tatemae* in classes.

Specific ways to do this are by not asking questions of the professor until he/she completes their portion of talk and don't challenge a professor in front of other students.

Recommendations for American study abroad advisors:

1. Advise students to adjust their expectations in regard to academic and intellectual pursuits. Advise them

that language and cultural learning should be their main motivation in participating in a program.

2. In advising students and cross-cultural orientation programs, stress the importance of club participation and the *sempai/kohai* relationship.

3. Advise students to participate in programs like Kwansei Gakuin's. Their program emphasizes language and cultural learning. The integration into regular Japanese university classes in the second semester was a positive factor in the development of a student identity for North American students. Even though the North American students were not satisfied with the academic aspect of this integration, their Japanese student counterparts viewed them more as peers and this improved interpersonal relationships between Japanese students and visiting North American students.

Recommendation for Japanese foreign student advisers:

1. As much as possible, work with involved Japanese faculty in orienting them to the way North American students are accustomed to participating in classes. This would not be with the intent of changing the approach of the professors. Rather, it would be for the purpose of increasing their awareness of cultural differences and hence not feeling negative when North American students do not act the same as Japanese students in a classroom situation.

2. As much as possible, offer independent study opportunities.

Hierarchy-Gender

Women's position in the hierarchy posed some problems for both North American men and women. However, the problem was larger for some North American women than others. The only recommendation for North American students and study abroad administrators is to be aware of the situation and adjust expectations accordingly.

Hierarchy-Alcohol Use

The use of alcohol, with males, is a mechanism to break down hierarchy and establish closer social relationships. The drinking of alcohol can be ritualistic.

Recommendations for North American students:

1. Women should understand that heavy drinking by women is generally not positively received.
2. Men should understand that an invitation to drink is usually more than what it seems. It may be the recognition of acceptance into a particular group.
3. When drinking, more honesty and openness is acceptable. One can worry less about *honne/tatemae*.
4. In a group situation, drinking partners do not pour their own drinks. It is necessary to keep an eye on partners and replenish their glasses for them when empty. Similarly, it is unwise to refuse an offered

drink by a partner. If one does not want to drink much, it is better to drink slowly and keep the glass full as much as possible.

Hierarchy-Strategies

There were a variety of strategies, in varying magnitude, for dealing with hierarchy. The three basic types of strategies were; (1) strategies which tried to influence the surrounding environment and break down the hierarchy; (2) clarifying your identity as a foreigner within the Japanese hierarchy; and (3) creation of a pack mentality among other North American exchange students.

While one must first recognize that individual decisions over which strategies to employ depend upon personal limitations and preferences, the second strategy listed above is most effective for developing interpersonal relationships with Japanese people. The students who accepted their primary identity within the hierarchy as that of *gaijin*, or foreigner, could then operate within realistic boundaries. Once this identity was established for themselves, they could more easily adapt to the customs and behaviors which would progress them at least somewhere beyond guest status.

Recommendations for visiting exchange students:

1. Avoiding the other two strategies is obvious. Trying to change the existing structure in order to fit in does not work and is not ethical. Creating and living

within a pack mentality also inhibits interpersonal relationship development with hosts. First there is the time factor. The time that one spends with other foreigners takes away from time spent with Japanese people. A group of foreign students spending time together also tends to discourage Japanese people from approaching and interacting. It can be intimidating. Being alone, in pairs, or in groups of three, provides a better opportunity for Japanese people to approach.

Recommendations for American study abroad administrators:

1. In pre-departure orientation and advising, the discussion of strategies is important. Topics such as expectations, goals, ethics, and strategies and their consequences should be discussed.

Friendship-Initial Interactions

A fundamental assumption of this dissertation is that a visiting exchange student must accelerate the development of interpersonal relationships from the beginning of the stay in Japan. This is because of the short time period of the stay and the relatively long time frame for friendship development in Japan. Initial interactions then take on significance. Initial interactions are those with Japanese people for the first month or two of the relationship. Since foreign students regularly meet new people, these

initial interactions happen on a continuing basis throughout the stay.

Recommendations for visiting exchange students:

1. Having realistic expectations is necessary. The students involved in this study expected to develop at least a few deep friendships with Japanese people during their stay at Kwansei Gakuin. They were all disappointed with their perceived lack of depth in friendships.
2. The need to create and maintain harmony is all important in initial interactions. Understanding the nature of *honne/tatemae* is helpful. As one Japanese student commented when asked to give advice to exchange students regarding friendships, "keep harmony and answer every question that you get. Look friendly." Successful students were able to answer questions that seemed to them to be private. They were able to present an appearance of friendliness by smiling and being affable. Steer clear of questions which require a personal opinion in the beginning. It is more practical to ask questions about family and personal life. This can be difficult for Westerners, as it seems that privacy is being invaded.
3. Understand that relationships build up over a period of time in Japan.
4. Invitations are a key part to initial interactions in relationship development. Japanese people will make

seemingly vague invitations in the beginning. This is a slow process of getting to know a new person. For example, after a tentative suggestion to travel somewhere together is made, a Japanese people will carefully observe the other's reaction. If it looks positive, it may be followed up. If one refuses an invitation, another invitation is not likely to happen. Therefore, Japanese people want to be sure the other will accept the invitation before they offer. It is important to keep this in mind. Acquiring an appointment book/calendar is a good strategy. If someone makes an invitation, you can take out your calendar to show your seriousness in accepting the invitation. The person can see you mark the date in your calendar. If you really do have a prior engagement and can not accept an invitation because of it, you can actually show the person the written date in your calendar so that they will not feel rejected.

As the visitor, it is a good idea to be fairly proactive in extending invitations. Don't wait for Japanese people. It will take seemingly too long. When making invitations, especially the first time, it is good to have a structured activity in mind. Inviting someone over to hang out is a little too loose. Initially, large group activities tend to work better.

"Going dutch" is generally not acceptable. The person who makes the invitation is expected to pay for the activity. This could become expensive in Japan if one off-handedly invited five or six people who are together to go and have a meal with him/her. On the other hand, it is good to graciously accept someone's treat if they invite you out.

It is important to follow up activities once they are finished. This applies if you are the inviter or the invitee. It is customary to set a "next time" for an activity with someone before saying good-bye at the time of a joint activity's completion. Along with this is stating what a good time you have just had. Even if the next time activity does not have a concrete time and place, the expression of wanting to get together again signals the enjoyment of being with the other person. If you are the invitee, it is important to thank someone again for the activity the first time you see them afterward. Sending a thank-you note is a positive gesture. Another customary gesture is to give photo prints to anyone who was included in a photo which you took during the activity. Purposely bringing a camera for this express purpose is a good way to develop friendships.

5. Cross-cultural discussions make good initial conversation material. Japanese people are generally curious about other cultures and appreciate it if visitors inquire about Japanese culture and society.

Putting yourself in the role of listener will make you attractive to Japanese people.

Recommendations for Japanese foreign student administrators:

1. Providing venues for the beginning of acquaintances and friendships is important. Kwansei Gakuin's program provided three excellent activities. These activities could be implemented by most any program.

The first was host family orientation. This allowed prospective host families and current exchange students to exchange expectations, so that both could better understand each other.

The office in charge of international programming sponsored periodic "coffee hours." The forum for these was as an open house for staff, faculty , and interested students. This was a time to meet international and exchange students. The first coffee hour of the semester was a venue for formal introductions of all visiting exchange students and faculty.

The third activity implemented by the office in charge of international programming was a "buddy system." They matched new exchange students with volunteer Japanese students. The role of the volunteer Japanese students was to assist the new visitors with their first month in Japan. It was a structure through which visitors could begin initial relationship development.

Friendship-Structured Activities vs. Hanging Out

In order to fit exchange students somewhere into their hierarchy, Japanese people tried to structure their interactions with the exchange students into three primary areas; (1) invitations; (2) teaching/learning situations; and (3) helping exchange students. Exchange students sometimes had difficulty with the structure desired by Japanese people, often frustrated with not being able to just hang out. Recommendations within the area of initial invitations were addressed in the previous section.

Recommendations for visiting students:

1. Participating in teaching/learning and helping situations can help facilitate movement beyond guest status. Although some exchange students did not want to be looked at as "walking English dictionaries", teaching English can be a structure in which a foreigner has status as a teacher. This can also become a mutual exchange of English and Japanese language. Even if one does not engage in this activity for a long period of time with the same person, it is an excellent way to begin relationships. It also provides a venue for getting beyond seemingly surface conversations. Within the structure of learning English, opinions can even be exchanged.

Another teaching/learning situation that can easily be entered into is allowing Japanese people to teach about Japan and Japanese culture. Japanese people offer to take

exchange students on trips to see cultural sites such as temples and shrines. Displaying keen curiosity and interest in these types of things will allow the Japanese person to take on the role of teacher, thus moving the relationship beyond host and guest.

Taking opportunities to help and be helped can also accelerate relationship development. Japanese people consider helping each other as a criteria for friendship.

Friendship-Time Orientation

In Chapter 4, it was seen that the definition of a friend is not so different between the two cultures. However, the time frame is quite different. Japanese friendships and other in-depth relationships develop over a longer period of time. North Americans tend to be relatively quick in their relationship development. Exchange students attend the Japanese university for one year. Compounding the short exchange time period is the difference in "life course" between North American exchange students and Japanese people.

Recommendations for visiting exchange students:

1. An extended trip with Japanese people is a very effective way to get relationships going. It creates a good memory as well as providing an opportunity to get to know someone in a less formal situation. Japanese people can relax more when out traveling.

Accepting invitations for travel or trying to create a travel situation are desirable strategies.

2. Follow the recommendations for initial interactions. Given the short time of stay and the usual need for a long and latent process of relationship development in Japan, it is important to maximize the success of initial interactions.

Recommendations for Japanese foreign student administrators:

1. Providing structured activities for initial interactions will help to solve the time problem. See recommendations in initial interactions section.
2. Sponsoring field trips in which both exchange students and Japanese students can participate would facilitate relationship development.
3. Creating joint projects in an exchange program would be an effective intervention that could stimulate more meaningful relationships between exchange students and host Japanese students. These projects could be academic projects as part of class requirements or independent field-based projects, if they could be accomplished for credit.

The preceding recommendations, as with the whole study, are an interpretation and synthesis of the study participants' and my perspectives. Reading the analysis and recommendations chapters of this dissertation could lead students and administrators to a greater understanding

of the nature of interpersonal relationship development, and therefore could lead to corresponding strategies. Cross-cultural orientation programs can extract content from these two chapters.

Research Recommendations

In the literature review chapter of this dissertation, study abroad research was examined in the context of sojourner adjustment, with specific focus on social interaction, and resultant interpersonal relationships. The approach to this study was based upon an analysis of past research and what had been lacking. In Chapter 3 of this dissertation, I made observations about the theoretical foundation and methodology used in this study. I described how the methodology worked or didn't work in this particular case. In the following recommendations section, broader observations of my research experience are made. The following recommendations are based upon both past research and my experience with this study.

1. The field should strive for a stronger theoretical and conceptual base. This can be achieved by using existing, inter-disciplinary social and behavioral science theories in a study abroad context.

This study was characterized by an analysis of social-psychological factors and cross-cultural value-orientation differences in a study abroad context. A review of past study abroad research and some existing social science

theory aided me in the inquiry for this study. More studies of this nature are needed; empirical studies which are able to incorporate many concepts and theories into single studies. The interrelationship of various concepts in single studies can provide a more holistic and rich understanding of study abroad.

I did not produce a body of theory as part of this research. However, the tentative hypotheses and their interrelationshps do present an explanation and description of the participants' study abroad experience. My interpretation of the participants' experience was largely influenced by value-orientation theory. The findings of this study--the tentative hypotheses--extend value-orientation theory into the context of this particular study abroad case. Applying value-orientation theory to the experience of the participants creates more meaning for the reader. In this way, it contributes to the conceptual base of the study abroad research field.

The use of existing social science theories in a study abroad context can then, in turn, contribute knowledge back to these broader fields. This can help to create more cooperation between social scientists and study abroad administrators. This cooperation between the two groups is necessary and there needs to be study abroad administrators who also can do scholarly research, providing a further connection between the two groups.

2. More qualitative research should be undertaken to complement the existing quantitative literature.

If study abroad administrators are to be consumers of study abroad research, it needs to be in a language which they can understand, which implies the need for more qualitative studies. More quantitative research is still needed for certain research questions, but particularly for social interaction research, qualitative research can contribute to study abroad's understanding by practitioners.

Qualitative data collection methods such as direct behavior observation and in-depth interviewing can help to solve the problem of whether or not behavior coincides with verbal reports. Student voices and perspectives are better incorporated into research which utilizes these data collection methods. The human, as the primary data collection instrument, is more cross-culturally reliable than traditional quantitative data collection instruments. Qualitative research is more capable of including the large number of variables and describing the holistic nature of the study abroad experience.

The study I conducted included an incredible amount of work. Hours of interview tapes were transcribed onto hundreds of pages. The reader of this kind of research really has to determine if the amount of work was worth the amount of learning derived. My interpretations and tentative hypotheses can help to increase understanding of

interpersonal relationship development in Japan study abroad programs. It is hard to imagine that a quantitative research approach could contribute to an understanding in the same way.

Qualitative approaches can be effective in study abroad research. Researchers need to be supported and funded. Kwansei Gakuin University is to be commended for their support of this study. It demonstrates their commitment to study abroad programs. I recommend that other Japanese and North American universities support researcher in ways similar to Kwansei Gakuin.

3. Research from non-Western countries, with researchers from those countries, needs to be increased.

This would incorporate more non-Western theoretical and methodological perspectives and would allow more comparative studies to occur.

This study did take place in a non-Western country and my research collaborator was Japanese. I learned an awful lot about Japanese culture, and Japan study abroad programs. This was largely due to Mr. Seiya, my collaborator. This personal learning on my part will be utilized in my future career endeavors.

If I had been more experienced in research and understood more about social science theory and qualitative methodology, Mr. Seiya's collaboration with me could have contributed more to non-Western theoretical and methodological perspectives. I could not always

incorporate Mr. Seiya's superior understanding into this study. Perhaps common sensically, I recommend that more experienced Western social science researchers collaborate with researchers from non-Western countries.

4. Attitude studies should investigate the nature of differentiated attitude development instead of favorable or unfavorable attitude development.

Through this kind of investigation, processes which lead to differentiated attitude development could be identified and analyzed. This would increase research into processes and dynamics that would complement outcome and impact research. This study did not lead to an examination of differentiated attitude. Post-return studies may be more effective for this purpose.

5. More longitudinal studies should be undertaken.

This would lead to more reliable empirical research, collecting data as experience occurs, rather than depending upon recall. If study abroad is thought of as a process, then it follows that data for analysis needs to be collected over a period of time. The longitudinal nature of this study was helpful in examining the participants' experience from a developmental perspective.

This research would not have been able to fulfill its purpose had it not been a longitudinal study. The entry time necessary to build up trust is very long. It was important to simultaneously analyze data as it was collected. It was in the second round of interviews, after

I began to feedback my interpretations to study participants, that any kind of real meaning began to emerge.

Pacing one's self is important in a study of this time length. It was important for me to take extended breaks from the project during the year of data collection and analysis. It was necessary to prioritize time and energy. For example, I took off periods of time between the two major interview rounds. I worked extremely hard during the actual interview period and just after.

6. More post-return studies should be conducted.

Post-return studies are necessary to examine the nature of lasting interpersonal relationship development, which has implications for international relations. The reciprocal nature of study abroad can be looked at with post-return studies. Post-return studies could analyze long-term attitude development. Examining continued culture learning upon return can help to uncover factors during the sojourn which led to or inhibited increased culture learning. These studies can also help to identify returned students' place in the social structure.

Operating under the assumption that study abroad is a life-long learning experience, it would be very useful to research the same participant group of this study. It would be very interesting to see how the experience affected the participants' interpersonal relations with

people from other cultures during the years following the study.

7. Host and visiting students should be included in the same study sample.

This is essential for investigating the reciprocal aspects of the study abroad experience. Studying both the hosts and visitors can help to uncover the factors which lead to mutually beneficial relationships, as well as increasing the reliability of the cross-cultural methodology.

The depth of participant perspectives and my interpretation could not have occurred without a cross-cultural participant group. As the researcher, I was able to see how the exchange students and Japanese people had different perceptions of similar experiences. These differences in perception often created the obstacles to developing relationships. An example of this was the different perceptions regarding initial interactions.

The combined Japanese and North American participant group not only made the study more reliable, but it also made the work extremely fun.

8. Collaboration between host country and visiting country researchers should be undertaken.

I commented on my relationship with Mr. Seiya under research recommendation number three. Research interpretation in cross-cultural settings can be more reliable by employing researchers from both cultures and

ethnocentrism can be minimized. Research methods can be adapted by a researcher from the same culture as the participants and are more culturally appropriate. Collaboration facilitates development of culture-general variables, which can be defined across all cultures, contributing to replication and comparison possibilities. As a result of my discussions with Mr. Seiya, the relevance of value-orientation concepts became clearer. He also assisted me greatly in the methodology. Lasting links between individual researchers and educational institutions can be developed, contributing toward a global intellectual community.

APPENDIX A

STUDY SAMPLE PROFILE

Study Sample

This profile of the study participants is done as a group. While individual profiles would provide richer biographical background, it would jeopardize the confidentiality of which participants were assured.

The study participant group included 10 North American exchange students, eight Japanese students, and six host family representatives, for a total of 24 participants.

Host Families

I did not record detailed information about the host families' backgrounds. Most of the host family parents had children of their own. They were generally upper middle-class with one or both of the parents working professionals. A few had sent their own children to study abroad.

Japanese Students

The eight Japanese students were all between 18 and 24 years of age. Their majors were Economics (2), Law, History (2), Educational Psychology, Computer Science, and Political Science.

Four had studied abroad for one year and one other spent 2 months on a summer program abroad. There were two men and six women.

North American Students

The Canadian and American students were all between the ages of 20 and 22. There were five women and five men. Their families in North America were middle or upper-middle class.

For the sake of confidentiality, I prefer not to get into racial or ethnic background. In the study I conducted, these factors did not emerge as significant influences on the experience.

Their majors were International Studies (2), Political Science (2), Commerce/Business (2), and Japanese Language/Studies (4).

Four had had travel experience abroad, five had lived abroad, and one had had no foreign country experience prior to the year at Kwansei Gakuin.

APPENDIX B

MEMBER CHECK DOCUMENT

Introduction

Dear Study Participants,

Here are the results of the first few months of my research project. Thank you all for being so cooperative. I have been enjoying this project and only wish that I had more time to spend with you all. The following short story is based upon interviews and observations which I have made since last September. This includes 20 individual in-depth interviews and one group interview, as well as many pages of field notes which I recorded after spending time with you all. Besides the actual information from you all, the story contains tentative generalizations/interpretations made by myself, Miss Mogami, and Mr. Seiya. These come through the characters in the story.

You will undoubtedly recognize some of the quotes and be able to figure out who said them, especially if they are your own quotes. Remember that the names have been changed to protect the guilty as well as the innocent. I have even divided up the characters' input into several characters. For example, when you see John Doe quoted, some of the comments may be the comments of the real person he is based upon and some may be from another real person in the group. In this way, each character is a composite and is not necessarily meant to represent a real person. You will notice that some of the characters are something like a caricature. This is done to illuminate some of the points through the perspective of a character.

The characters' statements in the story are all quotes of real people. Most of the quotes come from North American exchange students. Some come from Japanese students or other Japanese people. There are only three characters whose statements are not actual quotes from my data. Kevin, Zelda, and Percy say things that are based on the data or interpretations of the data, but their statements are not direct student quotes. I will be especially interested in your reactions to the interpretations made by these three and other characters in the story. These generalizations/ interpretations are not laws or truths. They are a tentative way to make sense of the data.

Please remember that the overall purpose of this research project is to increase understanding of the interpersonal relationships between Visiting Exchange Students and Japanese hosts. The overall questions are what kind of relationships are developing and why. This story is written as a step toward answering these questions.

If any of you have the desire to write down reactions to this story, I would love to see them. I will be asking you for specific reactions to the story in future interviews. It might be helpful if you write down any reactions to the story as you read it. These notes could be used in future interviews.

The North Americans, besides Kevin, Percy, and Zelda are all on exchange at Kwangaku: Mary, Jane, Bruce, Neshek, Margaret, Sean, Jill, Allen, Larry, Ralph, Mitch, Ned, Gerald, Hillary. The Japanese folks are all students at Kwangaku: Hiroshi, Suzuki, Atsuko, Miss Kawaguchi, Kenji, Mari, and Keiko.

** Please forgive my typing mistakes.

The story takes place over the course of a day at Sengari camp. It is Golden Week 1993. All of the Visiting Exchange Students and some Japanese students have gathered there for a farewell party for one of the Visiting Exchange Students, Kevin, who has decided to pack it up early and go back to North America (NA). He was supposed to stay until the program finished in July. In addition to the present Kwangaku students, there is a woman from SMU, Zelda, who will begin the exchange program this September.

BEGINNINGS, or PLEASE BE MY GUEST

(Several of the group are sitting around enjoying some *sushi* that someone brought. They are in a large airy room and the mood is relaxed).

KEVIN: I just have to leave. I'm pretty sick of being treated like a guest. Ever since I arrived at my host family's house, I've been like, come on, just relax. I had

hoped to be like a member of the family but it isn't working out. Man, at the beginning I had great hopes.

PERCY: Yea, it seems that a lot of people in the program had expectations that weren't met right away in the beginning.

MARY: My host sister, the first thing she said at the airport was, hello I'm Yoshimi and I want to become good friends with you. I said, well me too (laughter).

KEVIN: Yea and how about those same old questions everyone (stress on everyone) asked you at first. Jane, I remember that one woman you were talking to in Big Papa the third week we were here. You couldn't believe you were still getting these same questions.

JANE: We talked about the usual stuff, where I came from, where I live, and where she lives. I mean of course the number three topic was do I have a boyfriend.

PERCY: Number three topic?

JANE: Always. After where you're from and how long you've been here. I mean it's amazing. It's amazing. I mean even last night at that party. I was asked four times. Always, very strange.

PERCY: Where do you think that's coming from?

JANE: I think it's probably so much on their minds for one. Because I heard in high school they have zero relationships with guys and so in college it's even more liberal, it's like this dam effect of like desire. But then also in the media or whatever, you know Americans

especially might be made out to seem like they are always, like sex and love or whatever, is really an issue. I don't really know what they're looking for. It kind of makes me uncomfortable. I mean in Japan it's just the part of life you talk about.

KEVIN: What really drove me totally insane in the beginning was like why everyone (stress on everyone) was inviting me places and telling me to call them and then not following up on it.

NESHEK: I noticed that in the beginning if you just give someone your phone number, and say call me it is very odd that they call you. Usually I found that it's better to be the aggressor in that situation.

BRUCE: After I came here I called Japanese students I met in North America twice and they are willing to come out and do something. I think it depends on you to call them, because you are in Japan.

PERCY: I heard a lot of invitations being extended the first few weeks of the semester.

MARGARET: It's always this verbal thing like we've got to get to know each other and we've got to get to be good friends. But even this constant acknowledgement that we've gotta open up and be good friends doesn't get beyond a constant acknowledgement.

ZELDA: I heard in a cultural orientation class that Japanese people never invite someone to do something unless they are sure the invitation will be accepted. Maybe they

were just feeling out what you might be interested in so that you would accept the invitation.

KEVIN: You can hear a lot of things in those orientations.

HIROSHI: I know Americans, even they were asked to go out, they can refuse, even first time. Then second time the other person will ask him again. But here if I was refuse my invitation at the first time, probably I won't ask him again. I think probably he isn't interested in me. Even rain check. PERCY: Kevin, what about the thing you said a little while ago, that you are sick of feeling like a guest? What do you mean?

KEVIN: It's like in my host family. They won't let me do any of the laundry, help with cooking, or shopping. My host mother won't even let me air out my *futon*. And then a lot of times when I want to hang out with people, they act like they want to do something for me instead of with me. I've had it up to here with feeling like *okyakusama* in the environment I'm living in.

PERCY: Why would you expect to fit in as a member? I think that once you realize your first membership group in Japan is the foreigner group, then you can go on from there. Japanese people all have the same life course. Look at all these students at Kwangaku. They graduate the same time, get jobs the same time, take the traditional senior year travel just before starting on with a company. Japanese people often see a person from the viewpoint of whether or not he/she shares such a life course with them. If it is

the case, the person would be recognized as a member, or *nakama*. If it is not the case, the person would be seen as a guest or *okyakusan*. Exchange students do not always share such a life course so it is natural that they are often treated as *okyakusan* by Japanese.

KEVIN: Yea, well it sure makes it tough to fit in.

GIVE AND YE SHALL RECEIVE or VICE-VERSA

(Kevin, Zelda, and Percy have moved outside and are sitting with a new group of people and drinking tea).

ZELDA: How are you all finding relations with your host families?

JILL: Oh great, they really go out of their way for me. I've heard that's what Japanese people do.

KEVIN: When I first got here everyone (stress on everyone) was doing so much for me. I was finding it a bit overwhelming trying to like do in return for people, you know.

SEAN: That is my main concern right now, if I am reciprocating in the right way.

KEVIN: Japanese people seem so altruistic a lot of the time.

NESHEK: Uh well maybe the Japanese have a feeling of altruism but ah or at least think they are being altruistic and at the same time, they're not, they're being completely selfish. They don't realize it but they are being. A lot of times they do so many things for other people that, or

they go out of the way for other people so often that they feel there is an obligation there for the other person to do things back to them. Many times it leads to frustration and uh of course they don't show it.

KEVIN: Leads to frustration because?

NESHEK: The other person may not give it back, um but uh it's a very complex psychological web I suppose, but there's a specific vocabulary for it in Japanese, *giri*, meaning obligation, um and that's a very important part of this country I think.

SUZUKI: I don't have any ulterior motives. It doesn't matter that I keep doing something for you. It doesn't matter at all.

PERCY: It's my understanding too that since students are not considered *nakama* or members, the expectations around reciprocation are not the same as they are for Japanese people.

ZELDA: Don't you all think it is possible that Japanese people can do something for nothing?

SEAN: Not on your life! It's nothing malicious, but that's the way social relations are here.

KEVIN: I think if you all thought about it, like how many of you have befriended Japanese people who have no plan of traveling to North America where you might be able to give them a lot of information, or even be a guide or host for them. I feel like I should be a consultant for a travel

agency with all of the friends I have made who are planning to visit me.

ZELDA: But that's great that they want to visit you.

KEVIN: Sure, but just once I'd like to meet someone who doesn't want to befriend me because they might visit North America or want to learn more English. I'd love to become good friends with someone who says they hate (stress on hate) North America, but want to know me as an individual.

ZELDA: What a cynic you have become!

KEVIN: Hey, talk to me after you've been here a year babe.

PERCY: Don't you think this obligation/reciprocation thing is related to the hierarchical social structure? I mean I've heard of this *sempai*, or mentor relation with *kohai* or protege. The *sempai* is the upper classman and the *kohai* is the underclassman. I heard that it is natural for the *sempai* to give gifts and pay for things for the *kohai* and then the obligation for the *kohai* is to show respect to the *sempai*. In that way the *sempai* takes a sort of paternalistic role and you don't have to worry about the value of return gifts or favors for the *sempai*.

KEVIN: This is getting too analytical for me, man. Who brought the beer?

CLIMBING THE STUDENT LADDER or STUCK INSIDE OF NISHINOMIYA WITH THE EGALITARIAN BLUES AGAIN

(Most of the group is now gathered around the cold beer and the conversation becomes a bit more lively, the topic being hierarchy.)

ALLEN: In the clubs, it's perfectly structured. There's no holes in the way that it works. Everyone has a place. There's 25 members and they know exactly where they stand. And on the bottom are two young girls.

PERCY: Given that you are not *nakama* in Japanese society, how does the hierarchy work for all of you? Or against all of you? (laughter).

Sean, I heard that your club doesn't know what to do with you.

SEAN: It's like I just dropped down from another planet.

KEVIN: No wonder they call us aliens.

LARRY: Um, the thing I noticed was with the clubs you know there is so much hierarchy. Everything is like Allen said, rank and file and regimented and stuff like that. But since I've joined them I can see that things are starting to change a little bit. But it's just that rank and file military type structure. It's just kind of hard for us to fit into that you know.

RALPH: I think the people who are in high positions and the ones who don't like foreigners being outside the hierarchy, they want to squeeze us in under them. They tend to be really assertive with their authority. If you

don't respect their power, I guess, then they have none over you. And so I guess that really ticks them off. I think that hierarchy stuff is a big joke, you know, but they're taking it seriously. I'm like hey guys, calm down, cool down, but that's really fun.

KEVIN: I found in my club that out on the field there was a rigid hierarchy, but in the clubhouse or in social situations it wasn't so pronounced. Mary, I heard in your club you actually do all the grunt work that the lower classmen usually do.

MARY: Yea I do clean up afterwards and help set up the equipment in the beginning. No one has come up to me, you know, don't do that, you're third year um but no one has ever said that to me. So I do it voluntarily, it's no problem.

KEVIN: I had to quit my club, man. It was all too serious for me. The hierarchy was killing my western sensibilities.

LARRY: Did you manage to break it down any? Like get the guys laughing and joking with each other?

KEVIN: Like, I didn't think it was my place to change it man.

RALPH: Really, I'd like to meet people and see them as good friends, buddies type thing but every time I meet Japanese people, especially in organizations, in groups, it turns out to be hierarchy every time.

ZELDA: You sound frustrated. It sounds like your hope would be to have friends in a western context, egalitarian and just buddies, but this hierarchy thing seems to get in the way.

RALPH: Yea, everywhere. It's everywhere. Oh, I can't stand it. (Fakes like he is going to faint) (laughter).

PERCY: Has anyone else seen this hierarchy break down in social situations?

DRINKING CUSTOMS or THE GROUP THAT DRINKS TOGETHER STAYS TOGETHER

ALLEN: Well we went out drinking a couple of times and whenever the beer opens, have a sip the whole thing dissolves right there. But whoever has to order the next round it will always be the youngest guy doing all the work and stuff.

PERCY: It seems that drinking excuses most things.

NESHEK: Yea, it really does, it really does. I remember I went to a party once, it wasn't really a party, it was just sort of a nice dinner together and things like that and uh, these guys, you know these Japanese salarymen, you know these guys have these amazingly starched shirts, you know they're looking very sharp and they're very on the ball, they're very on the job. They drink one beer, like they open the beer and start drinking it, right, and immediately their attitude changes. It's not because of the alcohol,

it's because they have it in their hand, that's an excuse, so they can act such and such a way.

PERCY: I've heard that to drink together is a very important strategy to accept and learn about each other for Japanese people. In such situations even direct expressions of their feelings and opinions are almost always allowed. And to be invited to drink together after a long process of observation often means to be recognized as a member.

Mitch, why don't you tell about that dinner that your club had. It sounded like drinking was being used as a vehicle to accept younger club participants as members, in the most extreme way!

MITCH: Yea, so we're all eating away and I started to notice the first year guys were starting to get kind of red in the face and I couldn't understand why. And the fourth year guys were making them drink. They were just saying, drink and so they'd fill up the glass and say *itadakimasu* and boom, *gochisoosamadeshita*. You know it was great, thanks a lot, drink again, yea OK, fill it up and drink again. So in another fifteen minutes they are all totally red in the face from drinking so much. And it's all the first years. So Bruce was there too, and Bruce and I should have been doing this, like it's unusual for third year guys to join the team I think. But because we're foreigners we were omitted from this total drunk fest. And so we're all just sitting there going drink drink drink and um the

leaders and a couple of the older guys, graduates who had been in the club like years before, the old boys, they're just sitting there going drink, drink and these guys are just kind of huddling around them in groups around all the older guys and um I really feel sorry for them so I wasn't too much on making them drink. And um so after about twenty minutes they start to throw up. And um first of all the girl beside me whipped out all these black garbage bags onto the table and I said hey what's going on, what are we going to do, is this some kind of game, it looks great (laughter). I thought, like it's a totally great looking dinner and I'd never been to one of these bars before and it was kind of novel and it looked really cool. Everything was still pretty quiet. They were still making them drink but it wasn't like a rowdy party or anything. It was just kind of chillin' after practicing for three hours, pretty tired. So they started to throw up and all these garbage bags start whipping out, big black garbage bags. And they're just throwing up like crazy, and the other guys are drink, drink and they're not drunk yet.

PERCY: You mean after they're throwing up they're still telling them to drink?

MITCH: Oh yea. For about an hour and a half. So they've been throwing up for about an hour and a half and uh it was just grim, just grim.

ZELDA: God, I'm getting queasy just thinking about it.

(As the sun is setting and the mosquitoes arrive on the scene, the group moves indoors and begins eating a sukiyaki feast.)

PERCY: One of the Japanese students I met was telling me that he likes to hang out with North America exchange students because he can go out to a bar and drink and just talk with them. He feels it is kind of sad that his Japanese acquaintances always feel that they have to do *karaoke* or have some kind of special activity when they go out. Atsuko, you studied in North America. What do you notice that is different here in friendships compared to in North America?

ATSUKO: Here like with North America student, maybe our friendship is more international friendship, like our conversation is like sometimes um always maybe most of the time our conversation is about cultural difference or uh like difficult point or experience. Maybe yea maybe it's just the beginning, but I always look, regard them as an intern student. That's why. But in North America they regard me as just a friend, so that's different I think.

KEVIN: There you go, I just want to be treated like a friend first and not a foreigner first.

ZELDA: But maybe it's the first thing you have to accept here is that you are not going to be a member of this society.

JILL: As far as culture, or how to behave or how to act, I know that they seem overwhelmingly polite. And that kind of I feel like I have to be like that, but I can't keep saying I'm sorry, I'm sorry a hundred times (laughter). So I kind of just be myself.

NED: I find the best thing to do is to be a person who is a foreigner who has respect for the customs, but at the same time does not lose his identity in trying to integrate with society. You have to keep your own sense of identity, at least I do, I mean I can't deal with just blending into the group, sometimes if I'm feeling like a vegetable I can deal with it for a while. But I can't live like that for a long period of time because it attacks my ego.

ALLEN: I mean you shouldn't though, I mean you don't want to become a Japanese person. Because if you give up your sense of a *gaijin*, as a foreigner, then not only, you're making the Japanese, you're kind of forcing them to try and fit you into the social hierarchy somewhere. And it just confuses them and doesn't make you look good.

LARRY: I'm telling you, you can't escape the hierarchy thing eh?!

GERALD: I'm not really looking for intimate friendships in Japan. I'm just really wanting to meet different people and just um just explore Japanese culture through meeting people. PERCY: I wonder if the definition of friendship differs between the two cultures. What do you all consider to be a good friend?

JANE: I imagine this scenario happening, befriending this person, so that we could go out and compare notes, I mean, I really want to talk to these Japanese students. I want to know what they're talking about when you pass people in conversations. I want to know, do they talk about politics? What do they care about? So I'm really interested in what their passions are, if they exist. If I find nobody, if I don't find a friend who wants to talk about things really, situations, morality, politics, whatever issues, then I have to be satisfied.

MISS KAWAGUCHI: I would like to keep in touch with exchange students when they are gone by writing to each other and also if I have a chance to travel to another country I would like to ask Hillary for some information on it. Also I might ask her to show me around.

KEVIN: Here we go again. We could all be travel guides.

ZELDA: Oh, come on Kevin, you told me yourself that one of the favorite things for Japanese students to do is show you places where other *gaijin* seldom go.

ATSUKO: Yea, now I think mainly here my what I can do for them is uh to take them to Kyoto or Nara and to introduce Japanese culture to them as much as possible. We pay more attention to international people and try to communicate with them or treat or take care of them.

KEVIN: Back to the *okyakusan* deal again. Atsuko, I really like you and have enjoyed spending time with you, but like listen to your words; "what you can do for (stress on for)

us and treat or take care". Don't you see I didn't come halfway around the world to live for a year as a guest.

PERCY: During my short stay here, I have appreciated this aspect of Japanese culture, the kindness and hospitality.

SEAN: Friendship here is more of an exchange. Close friendship develops over a period of time. I don't expect to find this here. So basically it's a shotgun approach here. So I hope to have a variety of friends in different areas. To be very honest, one of my goals is to meet people here at the university who I can call up in the future.

ZELDA: Contacts.

SEAN: Yea, contacts.

MARGARET: Um, I'm hoping to do some kind of work which combines North America relations.

PERCY: Twenty years ago who would have thought that people would come to the home of "made in Japan" for future business contacts?

MISS KAWAGUCHI: My definition of a best friend or close friend is we talk to each other on the phone a lot and also one of us have problems or are worried about something we can help out each other.

PERCY: OK, Hillary what is your definition of a friend?

HILLARY: OK, like we usually just go out and just hang out with them, and like you just talk and get to know people.

KEVIN: It isn't very easy to just talk to people and really get to know them.

ALLEN: I'm really interested in finding out about the mind set of how people are and stuff, I just find that at a certain point they don't want to tell you what they are saying, what they are thinking. They don't want to open themselves up.

JILL: They don't have a criticizing mind. So I don't think they will say something negative. If they say something negative to you it's going to be indirect.

BRUCE: The main thing is that Japanese people speak very indirectly, so we don't know if they mean it or not. That's a problem between foreigners and Japanese people when they meet.

PERCY: What's the problem?

BRUCE: Indirectness. We really don't know if they really mean it or not. It's a very big problem.

PERCY: So have you learned how to figure it out if they mean it or not?

BRUCE: Uh, no not yet. (laughter).

KENJI: OK, yea, um OK, so Japanese friends, they're friends with walls, high walls. Then western friends with really low walls.

PERCY: (laughing) That one will go into the metaphor hall of fame.

MARY: So I don't know, I find at least in North America I find that the people that are my best friends are the people with whom I can have really important discussions. I can listen to whatever they have to say. They can listen to whatever I have to say and the opinions fly back and forth. Even the best of friends I argue with them a lot you know so it's hard, because I don't think I could do that with the Japanese students. I think maybe the reluctance of girls especially to talk about certain topics. Like, for example, I can talk with Jill about almost anything, you know joke about guys or something or you know any topic.

KEVIN: And you've only known Jill for about two months.

MARY: Where I don't think I'd be able to bring it up, you know like just the topic itself might be taboo, with the Japanese girls. Um I don't know and sometimes I'm afraid of, I tend to voice my opinions a lot. I'm afraid if I say something like, if I voice my opinion I might be afraid it will offend them because they don't think like that at all.

HILLARY: I haven't made any women friends at all. They have no opinions!

MITCH: I disagree. The Japanese women I know have opinions.

HILLARY: Yea, they have opinions about you and you love it (laughter).

PERCY: You know, you probably aren't going to get a lot of opinions from college students today when they are chatting. One of the strongest current group norms is *meiwaku o kakenai*, or do not make troubles in group activities. This doesn't seem compatible with expressing opinions. They are also rather rigid in *hanashi ga au*, or fit topics together. The one that could really get you frustrated is the norm of *tanoshiku hanasu*, or talk happily and avoid serious topics. It seems that harmony in interactions is more important than expressing opinions. We like to really get to know someone by having heavy and meaningful conversation. I noticed that a lot of Japanese people try to get to be friends through shared experiences. I've heard several Japanese students talk about the importance of taking a trip together as a way to get to know each other.

MISS KAWAGUCHI: When you travel together, the person has to be really close to you.

SUZUKI: If you don't have much time to spend with a person, you can't see much of the person.

PERCY: Means you can't get to know them very well?

SUZUKI: Yes, Or it means you can't get to know a lot in different aspects of the person if you don't have a lot of time to spend with them. If you spend a lot of time with that person you can talk about something deep.

KEVIN: For us, if the chemistry is there you might really get into something deep the same afternoon you meet someone.

PERCY: I see now why you need so much time to develop relationships in Japan if it is important to know the person in different aspects. This seems like a fundamental problem in developing relationships in an exchange program in Japan. Hiroshi, what stands out for you as far as differences with North America friends and Japanese friends?

HIROSHI: Like we express emotionally.

PERCY: Japanese people?

HIROSHI: Yea, I think. We express emotionally but sometimes I feel that exchange students are logic, like when they talk, when they communicate with us. Like sometimes when we discuss something or just talking, if somebody said a different topic, they said, no this is not a time to talk about that.

GROUP SOLIDARITY or THE GAIJIN PACK

PERCY: Miss Kawaguchi, you said that it's hard to mingle with the exchange students as a group. Why is that?

MISS KAWAGUCHI: First, there is a language barrier and second they are much taller than me so I think they might look down at me.

PERCY: Looking down not physically, but?

MISS KAWAGUCHI: Not physically. I feel this because they are bigger and taller than me.

PERCY: So it's mostly because of the physical size?

MISS KAWAGUCHI: First they are bigger than me and since they are exchange students I think they are smarter than average students, and also they speak English and I don't. Also when I'm with my Japanese friends, I don't have to be outstanding like when I'm with the exchange students. When I'm talking with exchange students I get a lot of attention from people, so I think I can't have any secrets with the exchange students.

MARI: When I see the exchange students, most of them are always hanging around together. I think it's the biggest problem. So when I see them I sometimes wonder why they came to Japan.

Neshek: We came here as individuals and didn't know each other, but you know it's the *Kwangaku ryugakusei* against the world. Some of us have tried to break off, some of us have tried to include Japanese people in the group, but by and large it's this huge white group, an organism unto itself.

MOTIVATION or WHY AM I TALKING TO YOU ANYWAY

(By now the *sukiyaki* is long gone and the *saki* is even on its last legs. The whole group, except for a few who turned in early, are sitting around in a large wood paneled room.)

KEVIN: Like I said before, I'm leaving because I got tired of people wanting me either as a free English teacher or as a tour guide in North America. I know a couple of you said that you came here hoping to develop future business contacts. I also wonder what other reasons people have for interacting with us.

ZELDA: I think in some cases, female exchange students gravitate toward unconventional Japanese women and vice-versa. I've seen that one girl you hang around with Margaret.

MARGARET: She's really outgoing, really short hair, an kind of breaks the rules here a little, I think.

ZELDA: Which rules would those be?

MARGARET: Being quiet, very polite, uh I mean she's polite but she's quite loud when we go out. And she sat me down and told me good slang words to know.

ZELDA: Conversely, I met a Japanese woman last week who said that earlier in the semester she was trying to make friends with North America exchange students but that she had given up. She said that not many people talked to her, but that especially the girls didn't talk to her.

PERCY: I know Larry is in bed, but he told me once that the biggest thrill for him so far was joining his club and knowing he was the first foreigner ever to join. There is that good old pioneer spirit. Bruce, what do you think is the motivation for the members of your club to have a foreigner?

BRUCE: First, it's not to compete, just to learn some other culture as a friend or try to make themselves special because we are foreigners in their club.

KEVIN: Suzuki San, what was your motivation in getting to know me?

SUZUKI: My policy is to get to know their real thinking, their interests. That's my policy and you are just one of them. I didn't have any particular motivation to get close to you. I don't have any ulterior motive. What about you Keiko? What's your motivation in knowing Jill?

KEIKO: I think there are many motivations or reasons for it. First I heard a friend, my friends were having lunch with her and I wanted to join them. Also, I heard that Jill is really cute. For me exchange students are really attractive because first of all they are foreigners and also I thought I could practice English and my friends have lots of interest in them. (Kevin audibly groans).

PERCY: How about host family motivation?

BRUCE: I think the objective of them is quite obviously for the son and daughter to learn more English. And to know more about culture of the foreign country.

JANE: My assumption is they have another daughter who is 18 and she is in California now. So they probably feel, well their daughter is doing a homestay with someone and they should do the same in return.

PERCY: I wonder if any of these motivations has anything to do with that obligation notion that we talked about

earlier today. You know, like if a host family had a son or daughter abroad, do they feel an obligation to do this in return? What do you think about people's motivation in general Neshek? What are the pros and cons for them in developing a relationship with you?

NESHEK: Um, the whole chrysanthemum and sword thing. On the one hand it's a prestigious thing to know a foreigner and on the other hand, there are many people who, depending on which way the wind blows, they feel oh being with a foreigner, that's stupid. You shouldn't be hanging out with foreigners. You should be taking pride in your own kind and stay within the fold of society. I think it's sort of a conflict for them sometimes. At least the younger generation is becoming more liberal about this sort of thing.

THE KWANGAKU RESEARCH PROJECT or WHAT AM I, A GUINEA PIG?

PERCY: Although I haven't met him yet, I heard there is a guy here doing a research project on your interpersonal relationships with each other. I didn't know there were research projects like that.

NESHEK: Yea, we were beginning to wonder ourselves. We haven't seen the guy much lately. We thought that it might have been some elaborate scheme so that he could get free housing here.

JILL: Every time I've seen him in the last couple of months, he just walks by mumbling something about transcribing interview tapes.

KEVIN: It was strange in the beginning when he first explained this project to us. I felt like a guinea pig or something. I was like always looking for the hidden tape recorder and ready to plead the fifth amendment if he asked me a question. But at the same time it was intriguing.

ZELDA: Has his presence here affected your experience?

KEVIN: Not that much, but the first time he interviewed me I think I was really overly positive about my relationship experience here. It was like whatever I said to him was going to be a reflection of my success or failure in this experience. And then when it was over, I felt like, this is it? I hoped I had said what he wanted, although I wasn't quite sure what he wanted. And then when he would sit in our classes, he'd be taking notes. I tried looking over his shoulder a few times but couldn't make anything out.

PERCY: He was probably doodling.

JANE: I kind of like having him here, because it is sort of a constant reminder of perspective, kind of, you're sort of forced to think about it in sort of an objective, general way. It sort of helps, I foresee it as maybe well, again you can look at every situation as sort of a cultural comparative thing, you know, sort of step back and be academic about it, if you start feeling lonely or something

like that, it's an easy way to get out, you know be like, well, it's just perfectly natural to feel this way (laughter).

ALLEN: I'm not big on writing a diary and that kind of stuff. But it was really neat just to hear myself talk in the interview, I thought it was really good to do that.

JILL: Well, I think the research project will be a success if he has at least one more party at his house. I heard he's having one soon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altbach, P. G. (1991). Impact and adjustment: Foreign students in comparative perspective. Higher Education (Amsterdam), 21(3), 305-323.

Altbach, P. G., Kelly, D. H., & Lulat, Y. G-M. (1985). Research on foreign students and international study: An overview and bibliography. New York: Praeger.

Altbach, P. G., & Wang, J. (1989). Foreign students and international study: Bibliography and analysis, 1984-1989. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Basu, A. K., & Ames, R. G. (1970). Cross-cultural contact and attitude formation. Sociology and Social Research, 55, 5-16.

Beals, R. L., & Humphrey, N. D. (1957). No frontier to learning: The Mexican student in the U.S.. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bennett, J. W., Passin, H., & McKnight, R. K. (1958). In search of identity: The Japanese overseas scholar in America and Japan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley.

Bochner, S. (1977). The mediating man and cultural diversity. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), Cultural learning: Concepts, applications, and research. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Bogdan, R. & Taylor, S. J. (1975). Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: John Wiley.

Brein, M., & David, K. (1971). Intercultural communication and the adjustment of the sojourner. Psychological Bulletin, 76, 215-230.

Breitenbach, D. (1970a). The evaluation of study abroad. In I. Eide (Ed.), Students as links between cultures. Oslo: UNESCO and the International Peace Research Institute.

Breitenbach, D. (1970b). Bibliography of studies on foreign students. In I. Eide (Ed.), Students as links between cultures. Oslo: UNESCO and the International Peace Research Institute.

Buchanan, W., & Cantril, H. (1953). How nations see each other. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Burn, B. B. (1980). Expanding the international dimension of higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burn, B. B. (1982). University goals in international exchange: Overseas study. In International role of the university in the eighties. East Lansing: Michigan State University, International Studies and Programs.

Burn, B. B., & Briggs, A. (1985). Study abroad: A European and an American perspective on organization and impact of study abroad. Amsterdam: European Institute of Education and Social Policy.

Burn, B. B., Cerych, L., & Smith, A. (1990). Study abroad programmes. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Burn, B. B., & Smuckler, R. H. (1995). A research agenda for the internationalization of higher education in the United States. Recommendations and Report of the Association of International Education Administrators Working Group based on the August 10-11, 1995 meeting in Washington, D.C. Pullman, WA: Association of International Education Administrators Secretariat, Washington State University.

Carlson, J. S., Burn, B. B., Useem, J., & Yachimowicz, D. (1990). Study abroad: The experience of American undergraduates. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Church, A. T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 91(3), 540-572.

Clarke, H. I., & Ozawa, M. (1970). The foreign student in the U.S.. Madison, Wisconsin: School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin.

Coelho, G. V. (1958). Changing images of America: A study of Indian students' perceptions. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Coelho, G. V. (1962). Personal growth and educational development through working and studying abroad. Journal of Social Issues, 18(1), 55-67.

Deutsch, S. E. (1970). International education and exchange: A sociological analysis. Cleveland: Press of Case Western Reserve University.

DuBois, C. (1953). Research in cross-cultural education. Institute of International Education News Bulletin, 28(9), 5-8, 60-64.

DuBois, C. (1956). Foreign students and higher education in the United States. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Eide, I (1970). Students as culture carriers. In I. Eide (Ed.), Students as links between cultures. Oslo: UNESCO and the International Peace Research Institute.

Elliott, A. J. A. (1965). Evaluation of international education, an administrative approach. Social Sciences Information, 4(4), 61-78.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. American Sociological Review, 27, 31-41.

Garraty, J. A., & Adams, W. (1959). From Main Street to the Left Bank: Students and scholars abroad. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), The interpretation of cultures: Selected Essays. New York: Basic Books.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.

Goldsen, R. K., Suchman, E. A., & Williams, Jr., R. M. (1956). Factors associated with the development of cross-cultural interaction. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 26-32.

Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1986). Decline and renewal. New York: Institute of International Education.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gullahorn, J. T., & Gullahorn, J. E. (1963). An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. Journal of Social Issues, 19(3), 33-47.

Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hegazy, M. E. (1968). Cross-cultural experience and social change: The case of foreign study. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota). Dissertation Abstracts International, (1969), 29, 3679 A. (University Microfilms No. 69-6, 853).

Hofman, J. E., & Zak, I. (1969). Interpersonal contact and attitude change in a cross-cultural situation. Journal of Social Psychology, 78, 165-171.

Homans, G. C. (1950). The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. American Journal of Sociology, 63, 597-606.

Hull, W. F. (1978). Foreign students in the U.S.A.: Coping behavior within the educational environment. New York: Praeger.

Hull, W. F. (1981). A modified culture contact hypothesis and the adaptation of foreign students in cross cultural settings. In S. C. Dunnett (Ed.), Factors affecting the adaptation of foreign students in cross-cultural settings. Buffalo: Council on International Studies, SUNY.

Ibrahim, S. E. M. (1970). Interaction, perception, and attitudes of Arab students toward Americans. Sociology and Social Research, 55, 29-46.

Iwata, R. (1979). Advancement in a schooling-conscious society. Japan Echo, 6(4), 18-28.

Jacobson, E., Kumata, H., & Gullahorn, J. E. (1960). Cross-cultural contributions to attitude research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 24(2), 205-223.

Kaplan, R. B. (1983). Meeting the educational needs of other nations. In H. M. Jenkins and Associates (Eds.), Educating students from other nations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaufmann, N. L., Martin, J. N., & Weaver, H. D. (1992). Students abroad: Strangers at home. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Kelman, H. C. (1970). The role of the individual in international relations. Journal of International Affairs, 24(1).

Kelman, H. C. (1975). International interchanges: Some contributions from theories of attitude change. Studies in Comparative International Development, 10, 83-99.

Klineberg, O. (1966). International exchanges in education, science, and culture. Paris: Mouton.

Klineberg, O. (1970). Research in the field of educational exchange. In I. Eide (Ed.), Students as links between cultures. Oslo: UNESCO and the International Peace Research Institute.

Klineberg, O. (1976). International educational exchange. The Hague: Mouton.

Klineberg, O. (1981). Practical implications of research on international student exchanges. In S. C. Dunnett (Ed.), Factors affecting the adaptation of foreign students in cross-cultural settings. Buffalo: Council on International Studies, SUNY.

Klineberg, O., & Hull, F. W. (1979). At a foreign university. New York: Praeger.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson & Company.

Ladd, J. (1990). Subject India: A semester abroad. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Lambert, R. D., & Bressler, M. (1955). The sensitive area complex: A contribution to the theory of guided culture contact. American Journal of Sociology, 60, 583-592.

Lambert, R. D., & Bressler, M. (1956). Indian students on an American campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Locke, L. F. (1989). Qualitative research as a form of scientific inquiry in sport and physical education. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 60(1), 1-20.

Lulat, Y. G-M. (1985). International students and study-abroad programs: A select bibliography. In E. G. Barber, P. G. Altbach, & R. G. Myers (Eds.), Bridges to knowledge: Foreign students in comparative perspective. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lundstedt, S. (1963). An introduction to some evolving problems in cross-cultural research. Journal of Social Issues, 19(3), 1-9.

Lysgaard, S. (1955). Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. International Social Science Bulletin, 7(1), 45-51.

Malpass, R. S. (1977). Theory and method in cross-cultural psychology. American Psychologist, 32, 1069-1079.

Marshall, T. (1970). The strategy of international exchange. In I. Eide (Ed.), Students as links between cultures. Oslo: UNESCO and the International Peace Research Institute.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mestenhauser, J. A. (1982). Institutional strategies in the international exchange field: In search of a new paradigm. In International role of the university in the eighties. East Lansing: Michigan State University, International Studies and Programs.

Mestenhauser, J. A. (1985). Concepts and theories of culture learning and Adding the disciplines: From theory to relevant practice. In G. Marty & I. Steglitz (Eds.), Culture, learning, and the disciplines. Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Metraux, G. S. (1952). Exchange of persons: the evolution of cross-cultural education. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Mishler, A. L. (1965). Personal contact in international exchanges. In H. C. Kelman (Ed.), International behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Morris, R. T. (1960). The two-way mirror. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Opper, S., Teichler, U., & Carlson, J. (1990). Impacts of study abroad programmes on students and graduates. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Oyen, O. (1985). "Marginals" versus "centrals". In W. H. Allaway & H. C. Shorrock (Eds.), Dimensions of international higher education. Boulder, Colorado: Westview.

Paige, M. R. (1978). Students as Sojourners: Research issues and topics. Unpublished paper presented at NAFSA regional conference, February, 1978, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Perry, W. G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1958). The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence. New York: Basic Books.

Schild, E. O. (1962). The foreign student, as stranger, learning the norms of the host culture. Journal of Social Issues, 18(1), 41-54.

Scott, F. D. (1956). The American experience of Swedish students: Retrospect and aftermath. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Selltiz, C., Christ, J. R., Havel, J., & Cook, S. W. (1963). Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Selltiz, C., & Cook, S. W. (1962). Factors influencing attitudes of foreign students toward the host country. Journal of Social Issues, 18(1), 7-23.

Selltiz, C., Hopson, A. L., & Cook, S. W. (1956). The effects of situational factors on personal interaction between foreign students and Americans. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 33-44.

Sewell, W. H., & Davidsen, O. M. (1961). Scandinavian students on an American campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sewell, W. H., Morris, R. T., & Davidsen, O. M. (1954). Scandinavian students' images of the United States: A study in cross-cultural education. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 295, 126-135.

Smith, M. B. (1956a). A perspective for further research on cross-cultural education. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 56-68.

Smith, M. B. (1956b). Cross-cultural education as a research area. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 3-8.

Spaulding, S., & Flack, M. J. (with S. Tate, P. Mahon, & C. Marshall) (1976). The world's students in the United States; A review and evaluation of research on foreign students. New York: Praeger.

Spear, S. (1992). Measuring education abroad: The continuing search for a more precise language. Transitions Abroad, March/April, 62-65.

Stewart, E. C. (1972). American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective. Chicago: Intercultural Press.

Strauss, A. (1987). Qualitative analysis for social scientists. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: Wiley.

Teichler, U. (1996). Research on academic mobility and international cooperation in higher education: an agenda for the future. In P. Blumenthal, C. Godwin, A. Smith, & U. Teichler (Eds.), Academic mobility in a changing world. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Useem, J., & Useem, R. H. (1955). The western-educated man in India. New York: Dryden Press.

Walton, B. J. (1968). Foreign student exchange in perspective: What the research tells us. International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 3(4), 1-14.

Watanabe, S. (1990). Framing in American and Japanese group discussions. (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University). Dissertation Abstracts International, DAI-A 52106, p. 2130, December, 1991.

Watson, J., & Lippitt, R. (1955). Learning across cultures: A study of Germans visiting America. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Weaver, H. D. (Ed.). (1989). Research on U.S. students abroad: A bibliography with abstracts. USA: NAFSA.

Weiler, H. N. (1984). The political dilemmas of foreign study. In E. G. Barber, P. G. Altbach, & R. G. Myers (Eds.), Bridges to knowledge: Foreign students in comparative perspective. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Whyte, W. F. (1955). Street corner society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wicker, A. W. (1969). Attitudes vs. actions: The relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. Journal of Social Issues, 25(4), 41-78.

Wilson, S. (1977). The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 47(1).